Mineral Supply (Silica Sand)

Key Partners

- South East England Aggregate Working Party
- MPAs with Silica Resources:
  - Surrey County Council;
  - Durham County Council;
  - Dorset County Council;
  - Norfolk County Council;
  - Cheshire East Council;
  - Central Bedfordshire and Luton Borough Councils;
  - Lancashire County Council;
  - Hertfordshire County Council;
  - Nottinghamshire County Council;
  - North Yorkshire County Council;
  - Surrey County Council;
  - Kent County Council;
  - Staffordshire County Council;
  - Lincolnshire County Council;
  - Hampshire County Council;
  - East Sussex County Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format of Engagement</th>
<th>Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI01</td>
<td>13/11/2013</td>
<td>SEEAWP Meeting</td>
<td>Minutes from meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI02</td>
<td>08/07/2014</td>
<td>Background Papers- issues and evidence</td>
<td>Summary of discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI03</td>
<td>13/08/2014</td>
<td>Background Papers- issues and evidence</td>
<td>Summary of discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI04</td>
<td>09/07/2014</td>
<td>SEEAWP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI05</td>
<td>27/10/2014</td>
<td>SEEAWP Meeting</td>
<td>Minutes of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI06</td>
<td>23/02/2015</td>
<td>SEEAWP Meeting</td>
<td>Minutes of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI07</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Durham County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI08</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Dorset County Council</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI09</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Norfolk County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI10</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Cheshire East Council</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI11</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Central Bedfordshire and Luton Borough Councils</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI12</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Lancashire County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI13</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Hertfordshire County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI14</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Nottinghamshire County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI15</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to North Yorkshire County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI16</td>
<td>21/09/125</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Surrey County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI17</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Kent County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI18</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Staffordshire County Council</td>
<td>Letter/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI19</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Lincolnshire County Council</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI20</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to Hampshire County Council</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI21</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Letter (attached to email) to East Sussex and Brighton and Hove</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI22</td>
<td>10/11/2015</td>
<td>SEEAWP Meeting</td>
<td>Minutes of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI23</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
<td>Email sent from SDNPA to Surrey County Council</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI24</td>
<td>09/03/2016</td>
<td>Email sent from SDNPA to Cheshire East Council</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI25</td>
<td>10/03/2016</td>
<td>Email sent from SDNPA to North Lincolnshire Council</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SI01: SEEAWP Minutes (13/10/13)
Welcome & Apologies

The Chairman welcomed Mark Worringham, Alethea Evans and Lester Hannington to their first SEEAWP meeting. Apologies were received from Stewart Mitchell and Ken Hobden (MPA), James Trimmer (PLA), Nick Everington (The Crown Estate), Mark Plummer (DCLG) and Sue Marsh (Eof E AWP).

Minutes and Matters Arising from 3 July 2013 meeting

Matters raised, other than those to be dealt with under an agenda item, were as follows:

2.5 The reserves data had not yet been received. Nick Everington had informed the Secretary that its production was imminent and had offered some of the data in advance. The Secretary replied that it was best for SEEAWP to receive all the data together.

2.6 BGS resource survey reports and maps are now on the Crown Estate website

3.1 PD said that minute 3.1 read as though SEEAWP members could only raise issues on the minutes in exceptional circumstances. The Chairman replied that he had not meant to suggest any restriction for amendments which would correct serious inaccuracies or factual
errors, but he sought to avoid minor text changes that would not significantly alter the substance of what had been minuted. Any proposal for an amendment should normally await the next meeting, unless harm or consequent mistakes might otherwise occur.

It was agreed that the minutes should be publicly available, and to that end, as DCLG had decided not to include them on their web, MPAs were asked to place them on their web sites. To avoid misunderstandings, the Secretary would clearly put Draft on minutes before they were cleared at the following SEEAWP meeting.

4.3 The last collated returns for AM2012 were received by the Secretary on 30 October.

4.4 No advance had been made on the definition of silica sand. The Chairman asked for the authorities with silica sand resources to draw up a definition. Raising the issue of AWPs collecting data on non energy minerals awaits an AWP Secretaries and NCG meeting. AWP Secretaries meeting had been set for 19 December.

5.3 & 5.5 The responses received on Oxfordshire and Surrey draft LAAs had been sent to the authorities.

5.6 The secretary had issued the checklist drawn up by DP.

5.8 SEEAWP views on Somerset draft LAA had been sent.

6.1 At the request of CM it was agreed to overcome an omission in the minutes in regard to the report by Mark Plummer by adding a further point:

- there is an update to Schedule 14 of the 1995 Environment Act separate from the Lord Taylor revised guidelines

7.4 The question of terms of reference (ToR) for AWP Chairmen awaits an NCG meeting for which there is currently no date. SEEAWP felt that a ToR was desirable, and the Chairman agreed that he would welcome it, as presently there is no guidance on a Chairman’s role. It was proposed that AWP Secretaries should also have ToR drawn up. The Secretary responded that he felt a ToR would be unlikely to add to the specification for Secretaries in the current contract. The specification is sufficiently detailed, but he would raise the proposal at the AWP Secretaries forthcoming meeting.

3 Local Aggregates Assessments

LAA Checklist

3.1 To assist the AWP in giving views on MPA LAAs a checklist had been issued with the papers. LH approved of the five sub headings, but considered that the rest of the checklist went into too much detail and beyond the NPPF and NPPG requirements. A ‘checklist’ suggested a tick box for all of the lines in the paper. The Chairman pointed out that the checklist was designed as an aid to the AWP and was not prescriptive. However, LH remained concerned if the checklist was adopted as the basis for the AWP response to an LAA, and then publicly available at a Local Plan hearing.

3.2 PD said that the POS/mpa were seeking to draw up an LAA guide for AWPs, and the checklist might be considered as part of that. He would feed back on this to the Secretary. The checklist was not adopted by SEEAWP, but, pending its replacement by other guidance, it would provide something of an informal ‘aide memoire’.
**Procedure and Timetable**

3.3 SEEAWP considered that it should give a response to each draft LAA that it received, separate from the minutes. The Secretary asked SEEAWP to be clear in the views it wished to send to each MPA.

3.4 CM had asked for SEEAWP to recommend a timetable for MPAs to submit their LAAs to the AWP. The MPAs said that although it is recommended that the LAA is included in an authority’s annual monitoring report, there is no specific timetable for the report. MPAs wished to have the annual survey data as soon as possible each year in order to update the LAA. However, SEEAWP saw no problem in the AWP annual report (which is to be submitted to DCLG by the end of June each year) using region wide LAA totals which would be based on data some 16 months old.

**LAAs in the South East**

3.5 The Chairman congratulated the MPAs on all preparing a draft LAA by this meeting, or in the case of the 5 Berkshire authorities, having commissioned a report for the whole of Berkshire. The Secretary said that he had passed on the views on the draft LAAs received from individual SEEAWP members to the appropriate MPAs.

**Milton Keynes draft LAA**

3.6 MC said that the draft LAA came to no conclusion between the four options for land-won sand and gravel. As there were no active workings for a number of years it was inappropriate to use the 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel. The three year figure of 0.17mtpa was more appropriate. In response to the Chairman he confirmed that although there was an issue of a site straddling the boundary between Milton Keynes (MK) and Northamptonshire, there was no concern from East Midlands AWP with the MK approach.

3.7 BS on behalf of industry said that MK had a considerable consumer base and that an assessment of population growth and housing would be a better measure than the sales average of the last 5 years. He considered that this would justify a figure of 0.2mtpa or more. MC said that there had been a disappointing response to the call for sites even though there were workable resources.

3.8 SEEAWP asked for a response to be sent supporting the rejection of the 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel working. Some support was given to the 3 year figure of 0.17mtpa, but MK were asked to undertake an assessment of future population, housing completions and infrastructure which might well justify a figure of 0.2mtpa or more.

**West Berks LAA**

3.9 MM explained the problems of obtaining data to prepare an LAA for West Berkshire. He acknowledged that this was a long draft LAA as it was principally prepared as an initial step for an Issues and Options document for a Local Plan. He had been able to establish that the 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel was some 439,000 tonnes, and the LAA proposed that this was the figure for which provision should be made. The landbank had declined to just over 7 years and needs to be made up if to be maintained. Rail imports of hard rock are a significant supply, but the tonnages are largely exported to other authorities. The figures for secondary and recycled aggregate are particularly significant to supply for West Berkshire as these now exceed land-won sales.

3.10 The Chairman questioned West Berkshire relationship with the other Berkshire authorities. MM said that West Berkshire had supplied its data to them and supported the proposal for
an LAA to be prepared for the whole of Berkshire – see below. However, West Berkshire would be likely to pursue its own LAA in parallel in future years.

3.11 SEEAWP complemented the preparation of a draft LAA despite the data constraints and supported the provision of land-won sand and gravel at the 10 year sales average which gives headroom for growth in the economy.

5 Berkshire Unitary Authorities

3.12 RW had issued a paper confirming that the authorities (5BUAs) had commissioned consultants to prepare an LAA that would encompass the whole of Berkshire, ie incorporating data from West Berkshire. The 2012 findings were set out for all Berkshire, including sales and reserves of land-won sand and gravel, aggregate sales at rail depots, and sales of C&D aggregates and capacity of C&D recycling sites. The 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel was 878,000. This is proposed to be adopted for future provision.

3.13 SEEAWP welcomed the proposal to complete the coverage of LAAs for the South East and for it to cover the whole of Berkshire. SEEAWP supported the provision of the 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel.

Buckinghamshire LAA

3.14 LH said that the views received on the earlier draft LAA at the last SEEAWP meeting had been taken on board. The LAA concluded that the 10 year sales average of 0.96mtpa should be adopted, rather than the figure of 1.09 in the Core Strategy. It is intended to start a Minerals and Waste Plan next year.

3.15 RF confirmed that the views of Bretts had been addressed. SEEAWP supported the provision for land-won sand and gravel at the 10 year sales average of 0.96mtpa.

West Sussex LAA

3.16 AE introduced the draft LAA which included part of the South Downs NPA area. The LAA proposed to adopt the 10 year sales average of 0.5mtpa for land-won sand and gravel. This was the combined soft sand/sharp sand and gravel total. A split had not been made whilst awaiting the outcome of the combined Hampshire, East Sussex, West Sussex, South Downs NPA study of soft sand. SC cautioned that although on BGS survey data there appeared to be soft sand resources outside the National Park, it should not be presumed that this area would yield viable reserves. Detailed investigation would be needed and in his experience much will be discarded as non viable. This could lead to an overall shortfall of soft sand supplies as the reserves in the National Park become depleted.

3.17 Industry welcomed the helpful summary at each section, and the LAA gave good direction to industry on sites. SEEAWP supported the proposed provision of land won sand and gravel at the 10 year sales average of 0.5mtpa, but considered that a separate provision within this for soft sand was desirable.

Hampshire LAA

3.18 PS said that the revised LAA used the Adopted Plan figure of 1.56mtpa for land-won sand and gravel sales. This is higher than the 10 year sales average giving flexibility for economic growth. The landbank is in excess of 7 years.

3.19 SEEAWP supported the LAA which proposed that provision should be made for 1.56mtpa for land-won sand and gravel sales.
East Sussex LAA

3.20 TC introduced the draft LAA which was also for Brighton and Hove City Council and part of the South Downs NPA area. He handed out an addendum which amended the consumption data in the LAA. The LAA uses the Adopted Plan figure of 0.1mtpa for land-won sand and gravel. There is an adequate landbank at the present time. Care has been taken to account for the sales from the major site that straddles the E Sussex and Kent boundary. Natural England is content with the LAA.

SEEAWP supported the provision to be made for land-won sand and gravel at 0.1mtpa.

Medway Towns LAA

3.22 CS said that there had been no land-won sand and gravel sales for a number of years and that using a 10 year sales average would be inappropriate. Medway had one sand and gravel site with planning permission for 1.2Mt of aggregate, but it had not been started. It is proposed to use the draft Core Strategy figure of 0.18mtpa. This would give a 6-7 year landbank from the permitted site. CS said that obtaining figures for secondary and recycled aggregates was a problem.

SEEAWP supported the provision to be made for land-won sand and gravel at 0.18mtpa.

Oxfordshire LAA

3.24 PD said that Oxfordshire had received criticism of the draft LAA suggesting a figure of 1.2mtpa for land-won sand and gravel. Objectors draw attention to the NPPF asking authorities to plan for an annual LAA based on a rolling average of 10 years sales data, and saw no reason why Oxfordshire should deviate from this. They questioned whether the methodology used in arriving at 1.2mtpa was robust enough to justify the figure. The 10 year average is 1.0mtpa whereas the 2012 sales in Oxfordshire were 0.7Mt. The 10 year average would therefore provide headroom for growth. What were the AWPs views on Oxfordshire adopting the 10 year average figure?

3.25 DP said that the temporary mothballing of three aggregate sites accounted for the low sales in recent years. Having adopted a local methodology devised by independent consultants, this was about to be dropped due to local pressures. BS said that the draft LAA submitted to SEEAWP gave the technical justification for the 1.2mtpa figure. No further data had been supplied to show the logic was flawed or to discount this finding.

3.26 JP said that he had attempted to use the methodology adopted by Oxfordshire’s consultants in revising the Kent LAA. He had found it most unsatisfactory, utilising national population consumption figures from the 2009 national survey applied to the MPA area. He had changed his mind since the previous consideration of the draft LAA and supported using the 10 year provision. This gained support from some other MPA members.

3.27 The Chairman sought to find a response that would encompass the views of SEEAWP. However, it was pointed out that Oxfordshire had not consulted on a further draft LAA revision to explain the current thinking. As no such draft had been submitted to the AWP for it to consider, SEEAWP decided that it could not give a written response.

Matters arising from LAAs

3.28 A number of MPAs are having difficulty in obtaining reliable and comprehensive data on secondary and recycled aggregate. The Chairman asked members to continue pursuing data, despite the difficulties, as this source is clearly a major contributor to aggregate supply.
3.29 It appeared that consultation with mpa may have been regarded by some MPAs as having consulted the industry. MPAs are reminded to also consult BAA.

LAA's from MPAs in adjoining AWPs

3.30 The Secretary reported that the First Review of the Technical Statement for Wales recommended apportionments for authorities in Wales at the ten year sales average. This will enable the limited amount of crushed rock exported to the South East from Wales to continue.

4 Marine Aggregates

4.1 SEEAWP 13/09 reported that the SEEAWP response to the MMO East Coast Plans had been sent on 5 October. The MMO will consider all the responses and expect to submit the Plans to the Secretary of State in Spring 2014.

4.2 A workshop on the South Coast Plans had been attended by MR and the Secretary in October. This enabled views to be given at this stage in the preparation of the plans.

4.3 The BGS report on marine aggregate resources had been completed and is now on The Crown Estate website. However, the reserves data from The Crown Estate is still awaited.

5 New National Planning Guidance and Update by DCLG

5.1 EM updated the meeting on:

- NPPG: the large number of responses were being assessed; he could not give a date when the guidance would be re-launched.

- EU EIA Directive: the UK is seeking reforms to avoid additional burdens on the planning system.

- Onshore Oil & Gas: guidance was issued in July 2013 and secondary legislation is under consideration.

- Red Tape Challenge: the reduction in regulations will be a benefit to plan making and industry applying for planning permission.

- National Aggregate Survey for 2013: the funding was in place but could not be accessed until 1 April 2014. However, in response to a question, EM thought that it might be possible to go out to tender, appoint, and prepare for the survey before 1 April 2014. SEEAWP urged that this should be done if at all possible so that the survey proper could start in April.

5.2 SEEAWP were dismayed at the delay in starting the 2013 survey as this provides the information on imports and exports and enables a better fix on consumption in an MPA’s area. It was suggested that SEEAWP should perhaps undertake a limited survey of sand and gravel sales and reserves at the beginning of 2013 in order to assist LAA updates. However, this would mean cooperation by operators with two surveys, and before such action was taken SEEAWP should know the wider views of industry and other AWPs. The Chairman said that any discussion on pursuing this at the AWP Secretaries meeting required a proposition. It was agreed that PD, LH, BS and SC would take this up outside the meeting and have a proposition prepared and submitted to the Secretary by 12 December in order that it could be circulated in advance of the AWP Secretaries meeting.
5.3 EM said that Mark Plummer apologised for not being able to attend the meeting, but he had a meeting with the Minister. The Department had a heavy workload but if SEEAWP members had a particular query, EM would seek to ensure that a reply was given. He noted SEEAWP's view that an NCG meeting in early 2014 would enable a number of matters to be discussed at the national level, and would convey this to Mark Plummer.

6 AM2012 Draft Report

6.1 The Secretary summarised the key figures and recommendation in the draft AM2012 report:

- land-won sales of sand and gravel and rail imports had declined, but in contrast marine dredged aggregate landings had increased for the second year running.
- reserves of both sand and gravel and rock had declined, but there was some 12.5Mt of sand and gravel in undetermined applications, and a 16.2Mt ragstone quarry extension had been permitted in 2013.
- 2.5Mt of CD&EW was recorded as recycled at fixed sites, but coverage was incomplete.
- all SE MPAs had submitted a draft LAA except for 5 Berkshire Unitary Authorities, but they have commissioned a joint LAA for the whole of Berkshire.
- the combined LAAs proposed provision of 8.65mtpa of land-won sand and gravel at the regional level, and 1.25mtpa of crushed rock. Such provision would be in excess of the 10 year sales average for sand and gravel (7.8Mt) and match the 10 year sales average for crushed rock.
- on this basis it was proposed that SEEAWP advised NCG that the region is proposing to make a full contribution to both national and local needs.

6.2 Table 4 in the draft report was the key table leading to the above recommendation. In previous years this table had compared the MPA and AWP reserves and landbanks against the guideline apportionments. The 2012 Table 4 substituted figures from MPAs’ LAAs, indicating if the figure was derived from an adopted local plan, a ten year sales average, or a different figure to the 10 year sales average. With the note from Berkshire setting a 0.88mtpa figure, the total for the region added up to 8.65mtpa. At this rate reserves of over 80mt would last for some 9.6 years.

6.3 The Secretary said that as he had received the last survey data on 30 October the report had been written hurriedly in order to issue it for the meeting. He asked for it to be checked for accuracy, and that confidentiality had been protected. He drew attention to specific sections of the report for MPAs to check:

- para 3.7 and a footnote to Table 1: Berks and Bucks re dormant sites
- para 9.1: all MPAs re adopted plans
- Table 1 footnote: Kent and Surrey re non aggregate use, and E Susse re workings not likely to be worked before 2014
- Appendix B: updates with revised wording or confirmation of no change was required from Bracknell Forest, Reading, Slough, and Windsor & Maidenhead

6.4 The Secretary noted changes given at the meeting to Table 4 (which would require changes to the text of AM2012) and would delete Novington Pit under E Sussex in Appendix C. He would also have to amend Table 4 and associated text if Oxfordshire decided on provision.
of a land-won sand and gravel figure at 1.0mtpa. The total proposed for the South East would then be 8.45mtpa, but the conclusion regarding making a full contribution to local and national needs would remain unchanged. The Secretary was grateful for the offer from AE to provide diagrams to illustrate the Tables in the report.

6.5 DP pointed out that although the reserves in the region amounted to a sand and gravel landbank of over 9Mt, this could mask a significant shortfall in soft sand reserves. It was agreed that reference to this would be made in the AM2012 text.

6.6 It was agreed that any changes recommended to the draft report and updating from para 6.3 above should be sent to the Secretary by 22 November. PD was given to 26 November to advise the Secretary whether Oxfordshire proposed a figure of 1.0mtpa for provision for land-won sand and gravel. The Chairman and Secretary then be authorised to finalise the AM2012 report, including diagrams, to issue it, and ask for it to be placed on the DCLG and MPA websites.

7 Any Other Business
7.1 There was no other business.

8 Date of Next Meeting
8.1 The next SEEAWP meeting is to take place at 2pm on Wednesday 12 March 2014 at DCLG Offices, Eland House, Bressenden Place, London, SW1E 5DU.
Joint West Sussex Minerals Local Plan

Engagement Event- Tuesday 8 July 2014

Summary of Outcomes

1. Background

1.1 This document summarises the engagement event held on Tuesday 8 July at the South Downs Centre Hall, Midhurst. The event focused on the first draft of Background Papers prepared in connection with the Joint West Sussex Minerals Local Plan.

1.2 Five Background Papers were presented to a targeted audience of district/borough and town and parish councils and key organisations known to have an interest in minerals planning issues in West Sussex. There were 39 attendees at the event.

1.3 This event is part of a wider informal engagement stage to support the early work on the Minerals Local Plan, aimed at gathering evidence, verifying facts and identifying areas of concern or support.

1.4 Event attendees were also encouraged to feedback any comments through response forms as part of a wider stakeholder engagement exercise being undertaken on the Background Papers running until 28th July 2014.

2. Aims of event

2.1 The aim of the event was to present the five Background Papers produced by West Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority (the Authorities), and to encourage informal discussion and feedback on the issues set out within them. The two overriding objectives of the event were to:

- Check information to ensure the Authorities knowledge and understanding of minerals issues was up-to-date and robust; and
- Identify potential issues, problems or concerns relating to the working of minerals in West Sussex.

2.2 The five Background Papers discussed at the event were:

- Background Paper 1: Setting the Context - Spatial Portrait
- Background Paper 2: Minerals in West Sussex
- Background Paper 3: Site Identification and Assessment Methodology
• Background Paper 4: Safeguarding Minerals Infrastructure
• Background Paper 5: Safeguarding Mineral Resources

3. Structure of event

3.1 Following an introduction to the work on the Joint Minerals Local Plan to date, the event was split into two main sessions. The first session concentrated on Background Papers 1 and 2, and the second session focused on Background Papers 3, 4 and 5. A copy of the Event Programme is included in Appendix 1.

3.2 Attendees at the event were split into five groups with one facilitator from the Authorities assigned to each group to encourage debate, particularly around the key issues and key questions identified within the Background Papers. A copy of the list of attendees is set out in Appendix 2.

4. Key issues and next steps

4.1 The key issues discussed for each of the Background Papers are summarised below. This summary presents the key issues raised, however does not provide a response or comment by the Authorities on how the issues will be considered as part of the plan making process. The comments from this event will be considered alongside the comments from the public engagement on the Background Papers exercise, which closes on 28 July 2014. Responses received in relation to the Background Papers will be collated and set out in an outcome report, alongside the Authorities response, explaining how they will be taken into account in preparing the Minerals Local Plan.

4.2 Information on the next stages of the Minerals Local Plan process, and anticipated timing, is provided in the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme available at www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf/mwds.

5. Summary of comments

5.1 Background Paper 1: Setting the Context - Spatial Portrait

Expectations for the Minerals Local Plan
• A discussion was held about honesty, transparency and realism in what the Plan can achieve, and what can be achieved from the planning process for individual sites.
• There were general discussions about the desire to see lessons learned from previous plans and experiences of the current policy framework used to inform preparation of new policies.
Spatial strategy
- Request for a balanced approach to be taken in the spatial strategy for both aggregate and hydrocarbon extraction.

Background Mapping
- Comments suggested the need for an overlay map to show location of minerals and constraints to be included in the Background Papers and Site Study document.
- A suggestion was made that the map should show location of other development allocations with anticipated timings, in particular to avoid conflict between housing and potential mineral development. Sites around Chichester which have been left wet following mineral extraction were noted.

South Downs National Park
- The importance that the National Park designation plays in setting the context for the Plan and future mineral exploration and extraction was highlighted, with the problematic impacts of China Clay extraction on Dartmoor given.
- A suggestion was made that the South Downs National Park designation could be reflected in a definition of sustainability so it is clear how this will be viewed when planning applications are assessed.
- A concern was raised about the fact that the South Downs National Park Management Plan only has a policy on restoration and no overarching policies for the whole park to give consistency and additional protection for its designation.

Local economic impacts
- Comment that micro-economic impact needs to be considered, for example local job creation from minerals extraction as opposed to local tourism economy impacts.

Site allocations and criteria based policies for non-allocations
- Concerns were expressed about the effect of additional demand for aggregates on communities already subject to previous or existing extraction, prolonging the impact of mineral extraction on these communities. This should be reflected in this Background Paper.
- Concerns were raised surrounding the allocation of aggregate minerals sites as opposed to oil and gas. Questions were asked about whether there would be specific policies tailored to oil and gas, or whether the same polices would apply across the board for development management purposes.
• Questions were raised about how additional sites outside the site allocations would be considered by the Plan.
• Questions were raised about whether there will be re-use of existing quarries or sites by the Plan.

Traffic impacts
• Concerns were raised around lorry routing along key rural routes across the county and through rural villages.
• Challenges were identified for how effectively lorry routing from sites is enforced, with a particular issue with routing agreement details not being passed to sub-contractors identified.
• The need for the highway authority to engage with minerals planning proposals at an early stage in the planning process as well as consult with neighbouring highway authorities on routing arrangements was identified.
• Lorry parking near active sites was identified as an issue for sites where vehicles arrive before sites open. It was felt that greater consideration should be given to lorry parking.

Consultation and engagement
• The role of community engagement and local knowledge as valid perspectives in minerals planning was highlighted. The importance of providing greater certainty to communities in terms of what will happen and when with future minerals planning was also identified.
• Concerns were raised about whether the Authorities are in liaison with neighbouring minerals planning authorities, in particular with respect to hydrocarbons and transport routing issues.
• It was felt that local champions would benefit from additional guidance to deal with oil and gas issues.
• A comment was raised about liaison with other organisations, for example the High Weald Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty in West Sussex.

Site conditions
• Questions were raised regarding any extraction sites which are permitted and condition stipulations around when the operator must commence and complete work by.

Enforcement
• There were general concerns about the need for strong monitoring and enforcement of sites.

Restoration comments
• Comments identified that the Plan should seek to provide greater certainty about long term plans for restoration and policies which are flexible enough to bring forward different types of restoration.
• Comments were raised about how planning conditions can be enforced, especially as operators change, and where responsibilities lie for maintaining/restoring disused sites. There were concerns raised around enforcement of sites that are not being restored according to their restoration plans.
• Landfill was discussed in relation to restoration of mineral sites. The reduced availability of landfill material to enable restoration to ‘land’ (not water) was noted as an issue.
• The importance of ensuring emphasis on high quality restoration of land/environment post-extraction was highlighted. A question was asked about to what extent this can be a key aspect of the original planning application.
• The question of the future of Shoreham Cement Works was also identified.

5.2 Background Paper 2: Minerals in West Sussex

General
• There were limited specific comments about this paper, as it contained mainly factual information.

Demand data and apportionment
• Concerns were expressed about the quality of data used to underpin the Plan, particularly the anticipated aggregate shortfall, as this is reliant on data provided by operators which cannot be robustly audited leading to scepticism.
• Comments suggested an additional, expanded explanation of the new system for aggregate apportionment was needed with particular concerns raised about the sales led approach and about the mechanism for responding to changes in demand.
• Comments identified a need for greater understanding about the potential impacts of using recycled and secondary aggregate on the need for primary extraction.
• A question was asked about whether there will be forecasting of supply and demand, and how this will work

Oil and gas
• Requests were made that British Geological Survey study maps of shale resources, fault lines and aquifers are included.
• Concerns were raised around how the Plan will address groundwater contamination, specifically in relation to oil and gas.
Clarification was sought on paragraph 4.24 in terms of the Authorities identifying the specific locations of proposed future hydrocarbon development, as opposed to paragraph 4.23 which states that the Authorities are not required to identify sites for hydrocarbon development.
As sites for oil and gas will not be allocated there was concern raised about the cumulative impacts of neighbouring possibly different forms of development.

Regulatory framework
There were conflicting views about the need for greater explanation of the regulatory framework in Background Paper 2.
Comments were also made that reliance on other organisations (as explained in section 4.53 of the Background Paper) is not enough and that the Authorities should verify and establish at planning stages that key issues are resolved up front rather than at a later stage by a regulatory organisation or as a condition. This comment included a request for a changing in the wording of decisions such that planning permission is not awarded until regulatory conditions have been satisfied.

5.3 Background Paper 3: Site Identification and Assessment Methodology

Hierarchy of sites and the South Downs National Park
Comments were made about the usefulness of including a hierarchy of acceptable sites linked to a strong spatial strategy.
A question was posed about if or how the objectively identified minerals demand for West Sussex should be met by the National Park within West Sussex.

Assessment criteria
Comments were made about the importance of a full assessment of criteria, not just a desktop assessment.
Questions were raised around the weighting of individual criteria in making a decision for sites.
Comments were made about the need to ensure adequate transport infrastructure is in place. It was felt that greater clarity should be provided about the criteria used to assess cumulative severe impacts on the transport network.
A comment was made about whether a policy condition can be included to require the minerals industry to demonstrate that “reasonable alternatives” have been considered in terms of minerals site applications for non-allocates sites.
• A question was asked about whether there will be separate site assessment processes for oil and gas sites as opposed to sand and gravel sites.

**Site identification and terminology**
- The need to look at sites not identified by industry or landowners was identified.
- The need to define “new” and “extension” sites and assess the impacts of both types of site was identified as important.

**Quality of life and cumulative impacts**
- The impact on the quality of life of future generations was identified as a key issue in the site assessment process.
- A question was asked about the separation of sites from adjacent developments, for example minerals sites.

**Site restoration**
- Comments about the need to give serious consideration to land restoration prior to allocation were made. Eversley Quarry was given as an example of good restoration for a site that was developed in a sensitive environment.

**Consultation**
- The need to include parish councils and communities as external consultees for the site assessment process was identified, particularly where neighbourhood plans are being prepared.

**Monitoring**
- A request was made for an additional Background Paper on monitoring sites and the implementation of the Plan involving a holistic approach with external monitoring agencies.
- The need to provide resources for parish councils to fulfil a role in monitoring of sites was identified.

5.4 **Background Paper 4: Safeguarding Minerals Infrastructure**

**Transport infrastructure**
- The issue of Shoreham Harbour safeguarding needing to be considered carefully given redevelopment aspirations and its role in being a major route for aggregate was identified.
- The importance of consultation with Network Rail to ensure continued transport of minerals by rail was identified.
- The issue of the need to support infrastructure improvements including to road networks to enable efficient movement of minerals was identified.
- A concern was raised that there was little detail on road transport infrastructure and its importance to the movement of minerals within this Background Paper.

5.5 **Background Paper 5: Safeguarding Mineral Resources**

*Safeguarding*
- The buffer used to initiate safeguarding consultations was generally considered adequate although it was noted that previous experiences with safeguarding should be used to test this.
- The need for districts to have clarification on “show-stopping” Mineral Safeguarding Areas was identified.
- The issue of minerals being a finite resource which will run out some time in the future was identified.

*Recycled aggregates*
- The importance of recycling of aggregate being given more emphasis was identified, including by additional reference to the Waste Local Plan. A question was also asked about the role that different sources of supply play in the minerals aggregate supply chain.

5.6 **General comments**

- Questions were raised about the Plan preparation process and the length of time expected until adoption anticipated in 2017.
- Some attendees were concerned that there was too much information to digest and suggested that executive summaries of the Background Papers should have been produced.
- Some attendees reported difficulties in accessing the Background Papers from the Minerals Local Plan website.
- Some attendees were concerned that executive summaries could be too simplistic and would overshadow the detail contained within the main text.
## Appendix 1: Session Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Programme Item</th>
<th>Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.00-13.30</td>
<td>Registration and refreshments 30 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30-13.35</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction 5 mins</td>
<td>Tim Slaney, SDNPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.35 – 13.45</td>
<td>Presentation: Joint Minerals Local Plan 10 mins</td>
<td>Alethea Evans, WSCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45-14.15</td>
<td><strong>Group Session 1</strong></td>
<td>Group Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background Paper 1: Spatial Portrait</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background Paper 2: Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10 – 14.25</td>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong>: from Group Session 1 15 mins</td>
<td>Alethea Evans, WSCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.25 – 15.05</td>
<td><strong>Group Session 2</strong></td>
<td>Group Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background Paper 3: Site Identification and Assessment Methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background Paper 4: Safeguarding Mineral Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background Paper 5: Safeguarding Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.05 – 15.20</td>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong>: from Group Session 2 15 mins</td>
<td>Alethea Evans, WSCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.20 – 15.25</td>
<td>Presentation: Next Steps 5 mins</td>
<td>Alethea Evans, WSCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Attendees
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<table>
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</tr>
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<td>Senior Planning Officer (WSCC)</td>
</tr>
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<td>2</td>
<td>Tim Slaney</td>
<td>Director of Planning (SDNPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Darryl Hemmings</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transport Policy Manager (WSCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rupy Sandhu</td>
<td>Planning Officer (WSCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jamie Dallen</td>
<td>Assistant Planning Officer (WSCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Claire Potts</td>
<td>Minerals and Waste Manager (SDNPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peter Wilsdon</td>
<td>Minerals and Waste Planning Officer (SDNPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delegates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clive Needham</td>
<td>West Chiltington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jess Price</td>
<td>Sussex Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sylvia McCallum</td>
<td>Lynchmere Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chris Watson</td>
<td>West Itchenor Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Steve Ankers</td>
<td>South Downs Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Harold Keel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peggy Wood</td>
<td>Westhampnett Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Roger Smith</td>
<td>CPRE Chichester/South Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Andrew Shaw</td>
<td>High Weald AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sarah Bain</td>
<td>National Trust Property Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Diana Vanderklugt</td>
<td>Parham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Martin Buckley</td>
<td>Graffham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Liz Williams</td>
<td>Duncton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kevin Bottomley</td>
<td>Balcombe Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>David Brittain</td>
<td>Fittleworth Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Roger Hobbs</td>
<td>Summersdale Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Andrew Shaxton</td>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Derek Stewart Smith</td>
<td>Graffham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mr Jeremy Bonnett</td>
<td>Lurgashall Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr Alan Smith</td>
<td>CPRE Chichester/South Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Josef Ransley</td>
<td>Kirdford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Simon Oakley</td>
<td>Member West Sussex County Council/Chichester District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>David Todd</td>
<td>Westhampnett Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Michael Brown</td>
<td>CPRE Chichester/South Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Michael Crawford</td>
<td>Stedham with Iping Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mike Balmforth</td>
<td>Bepton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Anthony Davies</td>
<td>Compton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Iain Skinner</td>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gerard Conway</td>
<td>Cuckfield Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mike Allgrove</td>
<td>Chichester District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>John Popplewell</td>
<td>Compton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Helen Hollowood</td>
<td>Bepton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>John Havenhand</td>
<td>Findon Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Eddie Lintott</td>
<td>Stedham with Iping Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Claire Tester</td>
<td>Mid Sussex District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cllr Carol Purnell</td>
<td>Chichester District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Judith MacDonald-Lawson</td>
<td>Easebourne Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>John Mayes</td>
<td>Duncton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Norman Webster</td>
<td>Mid Sussex District Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SI03: Summary of Responses to Background Papers (13/08/2014)
Joint West Sussex Minerals Local Plan

Engagement Event- Wednesday 13 August 2014

Summary of Outcomes

1. Background

1.1 This document summarises the engagement event held on Wednesday 13 August at the South Downs Centre Hall, Midhurst. The event focused on four main mineral issues pertinent to the preparation of the new Joint Minerals Local Plan covering West Sussex:

- A steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals in West Sussex;
- Non-aggregate minerals in West Sussex;
- Mineral site allocations for the Joint MLP; and
- Safeguarding mineral resources and infrastructure.

1.2 This event is part of a wider informal engagement stage to support the early work on the Joint Minerals Local Plan. This session was aimed at gathering evidence, verifying facts and identifying areas of concern or support from the mineral industry, landowners and their representatives. The summary of the four discussion areas, set out below, represent the views of the attendees.

1.3 Additionally, event attendees were encouraged to feedback any comments through response forms as part of a wider stakeholder engagement exercise focused on the Mineral Sites Study running until 22nd September 2014.

2. Aims of event

2.1 The aim of the event was to update attendees on the progress to date towards the development of a new Minerals Local Plan being prepared in partnership by West Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. The two overriding objectives of the event were to:

- Check information to ensure the Authorities knowledge and understanding of minerals issues was up-to-date and robust; and
- Identify potential issues, problems or concerns relating to the working of minerals in West Sussex.

3. Structure of event
3.1 Following an introduction to the work on the Joint Minerals Local Plan to date, the event was split into four sessions:

**Session 1:** A steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals in West Sussex;

**Session 2:** Non-aggregate minerals in West Sussex;

**Session 3:** Mineral site allocations for the Joint MLP; and

**Session 4:** Safeguarding mineral resources and infrastructure.

3.2 A copy of the Event Programme is included in Appendix 1.

3.3 Attendees at the event were split into four groups with one facilitator from the Authorities assigned to each group to support debate and encourage questions. A copy of the list of attendees is set out in Appendix 2.

4. **Key issues and next steps**

4.1 The key issues discussed in each session are summarised below. This summary presents the key issues raised, however does not provide a response or comment by the Authorities on how the issues will be considered as part of the plan making process. The comments from this event will be considered alongside the feedback received throughout the early engagement stage to assist in the development of the draft Plan in 2015. This includes comments from the public engagement on the Background Papers (which closed on 28 July 2014), other engagement events and the comments received in relation to from the Mineral Sites Study.

4.2 Information on the next stages of the Joint Minerals Local Plan process, and anticipated timing, is provided in the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme available at [www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf/mwds](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf/mwds).

5. **Summary of comments**

**Session 1: A steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals in West Sussex Minerals Local Plan**

**General**

- Aggregate markets transcend boundaries – there is a need to look beyond local demand.
- Minerals and localism won’t work. Needs to be viewed as a bigger picture than just local need.
- Consideration of how the resource base will change with permissions and in respect of future demand.
• NPPF uses the phrase “great weight” in relation to various aspects. How do you balance this with the economic need to provide minerals?
• Plans are landbank driven, however we should be considering supply, not landbanks, to gain a fuller picture.
• Consideration needed to the dynamic of local need, regional need, and national need.
• The 4-yearly Aggregates Survey will still take place; and record data for 2013 as planned (confirmed by representative from the Department of Communities and Local Government).
• MLP policies should allow for windfall sites (flexibility):
  o sites should be allocated, as windfall sites are a greater risk if planning permission is refused (cost implications for operators).
  o Allocations provide more certainty to the operators. “Can’t invest in maybe”
  o This was countered with the point that a number of allocated sites are not brought forward for development, and this can restrict the supply of aggregates to market from windfall sites.
• Land won aggregate sales may be falling due to the cost implications of gaining planning permission, and the costs of operating sites with multiple issues (mitigation). Meanwhile marine won aggregates have fewer issues, and licenses have been granted, thus operators may be focusing their business there.
  o This clearly links to the importance of safeguarding wharves.
• The Plan should be flexible, and the LAA should be used to trigger a Plan review, if evidence suggests the demand for aggregates is going beyond supply provided by site allocations.
• There should be a straightforward extension policy to support existing sites.
• The Plan should be flexible to meet supply and demand – if there is an unexpected change in baseline evidence, the Plan should be able to react.
• If enough sites are allocated in the Plan then the industry will react to the market accordingly.
• One of the key challenges is the lack of nominations for aggregate extraction, leaving limited options. The Plan cannot allocate what’s not available.
• Getting a site permitted takes 5-10 years. Large multinational companies have started looking abroad. The industry needs certainty through allocations.
• The industry works to different time frames to the development Plans timetables, creating a challenge.
• There was a discussion about the need for upgrades to the A27 choke points. Perhaps the Plan should include an assessment of the aggregate demand for such works?
Local Aggregates Assessment

- LAA’s provide a good local context, however minerals travel beyond boundaries – the Plan should seek to understand the distance travelled.
- The mineral haulage distance is dependent on the mode of transport. Barged materials travel further.
- What role does the LAA background work have to do when it comes to the Duty to Co-operate? Adds another element for consideration.
- What is meaningful co-operation in relation to the LAA and minerals?
- There has been a ripple effect on aggregate production as a result of the economic downturn, 30% drop but now starting to recover.

Soft Sand v Sharp Sand and Gravel

- Other authorities produce separate landbanks and need requirements for soft sand and sharp sand.
- Given the commercial confidentially issues in West Sussex, estimates may need to be used in the MLP and this would be acceptable to the industry.
- Dorset CC’s policy on this issue may be useful.

Clay

- Should consider resource areas of clay (beyond own boundaries) rather than reserves at other counties. Attempt to grow a bigger picture.
- Brick production fell heavily during the recession – brick clay usage is strongly linked to housing completions.

Silica Sand

- Is an industrial mineral;
- Number of categories to consider;
- These types of sites also tend to contain other sands (soft or sharp).

Mineral Forecasting

- Data reliability was a recurring theme.
- The economic recession has had an impact for six years. The forecasts should attempt to look further back at sales and other factors to try and see if there is a long term trend (over past 20 years);
- Economic recovery is perceived to have started, thus is likely to see mineral demand increase.
- Assessing housing completions and planned housing may not capture the entire picture of aggregate use in housing. What about maintenance? How will this translate into the forecast?
- Question was raised about whether or not planning inspectors look at areas that use up resource, such as the relationship between housing and mineral use.
Discussions around the merits of forecasting were brought up. For example, why not just plan for the calculated rolling 10-year average of sales, particularly in light of the detailed aggregate forecasting work carried out by Oxfordshire CC which was not taken forward.

Should consider other key works going on which may impact on demand:
- Cross Rail
- Gatwick 2
- Heathrow runway 3
- High Speed 2

Building techniques are changing, what impact will they have on aggregate demand? i.e. The use of other materials such as glass and steel.

Should look at Nationally Significant Infrastructure Plan projects (Macro level)

Should consider flood alleviation works and the aggregates they demand

Marine won aggregates
- Marine won aggregates need consideration also, not just land won sand and gravel, when it comes to forecasting.
- Availability of marine won soft sand was raised, however WSCC confirmed that that the Crown Estate have considered it to be unviable- too much processing would be required and operators are have not shown an interest as a result. Industry representatives did not challenge this view.

Session 2: Non-aggregate Minerals in West Sussex

Chalk
- No demand for site allocations unless linked to cement production which is no longer occurring in the Plan area.
- Possible need for clay to add to mix for cement production but this depends on the type of chalk being used.
- Still used for agricultural lime but the demand for this use has declined as farmers are using other alternative products.
- Recycled aggregate has replaced use of chalk for low grade construction type uses – less economically viable to use chalk as the aggregate levy would apply.
- May be used for one-off road construction projects
- Some flint in Upper Beeding Quarry. Chalk at Upper Beeding Quarry a ‘hard’ chalk making it difficult to extract.

Recycled and secondary aggregates
• Still close link between quarries and inert waste recycling operations – makes financial sense to link the two when quarries are operational.
• Policies in Minerals Plan need to link in and work consistently with Waste Local Plan policies to ensure that capacity for recycling in quarries is maintained
• Need a flexible approach to ensure that recycling facilities in quarries can continue within protected landscapes – due to the high coverage of designations within the Plan area.
• Supply of material – relies on redevelopment taking place, does travel from London
• Higher specification recycled aggregate being developed to increase the range of uses in construction.

Oil and Gas
• Discussions around whether to allocate sites or use a criteria based policy approach
• Suggestions made around potential for use of surplus public sector land, waste water treatment works or quarry sites for locating exploration sites
• Rural locations are problematic due to vehicle movements

Silica sand
• The quality of the sand affects whether it is considered as ‘industrial sand’.
• All of the Folkstone Beds are silica sand.
• Need evidence about the geological characteristics of the deposit- borehole evidence likely to be necessary.
• ‘Soft sand’ implies a building sand but sand from current sites used for a variety of end markets – e.g. sports pitch sand, concreting sand, cattle bedding.
• Different markets depending on the product.
• Classification difficult and needs to be carefully considered.
• Colour variations in sand.
• Uncertainty about the quality of the sand resource outside the SDNP – view that it wasn’t suitable but not sure whether any evidence available to justify.
• Plan can’t dictate the market end use of sand extracted from any one site
• To produce a silica sand of glass making quality would require extensive processing (and associated equipment) and considerable investment.

Clay
• Generally sufficient supply at individual brickworks but always considering future reserves.
• Specialist bricks produced by brickworks in the Plan area (e.g. at Freshfield Lane Brickworks) continue to be popular and new techniques are being sought to replication clamp fired bricks
• Increasing trend for architects to specify particular type of locally distinctive brick.
• Windfall provision of clay needs to be considered e.g. from prior extraction from a housing development.
• Safeguarding of clay needs to work in practice – best applied to larger sites as prior extraction would not be viable on smaller sites.
• Viable to transport clay from up to 25- 30 miles away.
• Important to get the right blend of clay to produce the right end product for the market – consistency and colour of brick is important to customers.
• Clay for flood defences was raised – want to make sure that clay from brickworks is preserved for brickworks – is a policy needed to address this issue?
• If clay is extracted from elsewhere, space is needed on brickworks site to stockpile it.
• Restoration of claypits is an issue – now less material is available for restoration.
• Permissions need to consider the availability of restoration material and allow for changing circumstances.
• Brickworks need other additives for brickmaking – does Plan need to consider the continued availability of other minerals e.g. chalk.
• Potential for linking with other quarries was discussed e.g. using clay overburden from a sand quarry.

Building Stone
• Discussion about whether the Upper Greensand was quarried for stone anymore.
• Continuing demand for building stone – plus trend towards increased use of stone for new build, not just repair.
• Access to stone quarries can be poor, policy needs to recognise constrained location.
• ‘Waste’ stone needs to be dealt with – can be used as an aggregate and this needs to be considered in the Plan
• Quarries should not have to prove ‘need’, as market will drive applications, but may also be speculative applications
• Lorry movements – emphasis on restricting lorry movements can cause problems due to variable contracts. Limiting lorry movements can affect the viability of an operation.

Other issues raised
• Community benefits need to be considered.
• Liaison groups – can work well but not always well attended.
• Overall paucity of data for non-aggregate minerals.
• Borrow pits- how will the Plan handle this?

Session 3: Mineral site allocations for the Joint Minerals Local Plan

**Deliverability**
- Sites that have been previously allocated and not developed keep being put on short list resulting in large operators sitting on sites for years.
- Applications are being made according to the larger operators and not just for large reserves.
- Larger operators have higher returns thresholds meaning that it might not be viable to develop sites at a particular time but they could not rule out a site being developed during the plan period at this stage. Circumstances change such as ownership, landlord’s aspiration for restored site use, etc.
- Industry would prefer to see far more flexibly in taking sites forward such as areas of search for example.
- Impact of marine-won aggregates – easier option for large operators.
- UK seen as difficult to bring sites forward and therefore multinationals look elsewhere first.
- Not in the interest of the MPA to have operators sit on sites. Industry must provide evidence as to why sites have not been developed or else drop from the list.
- Some operators work to much shorter timeframes than the plan. Planning for sites to develop in 10+ years’ time does not fit with the way the industry works.
- Quicker decision making needed to help develop sites. An application can take so long to prepare that a site that was deliverable and viable at the time the plan was written may no longer be available.

**Site Assessment Methodology**
- Needs to consider issues such availability of water for washing of aggregates – questionable if sites west of Chichester can be delivered because of this issue. Cannot expect industry to undertake large studies at this stage as it is no guarantee that planning permission will be granted.
- Industry should only be expected to carry out further work/studies if it is a ‘showstopper’.
- Studies undertaken by industry can be out of date within a year.
- Front loading of assessment work prohibitively expensive for smaller operators.
- Kent County Council only required geological information.
Assessment work needs to be kept simple.
Industry need adequate time to consider outcomes of study considering costs involved if a lot of work is needed to be carried out.
General consensus that a certain degree of flexibility is required.
The more sites allocated the more certainty the industry has.
Number of sites allocated needs to reflect the fact that recoverable resources can be considerably less put forward during the call for sites.
Appendix 2 of the Mineral Sites Study – full rejected site proformas need to be included for transparency.
The Authorities need to go back to landowners to check deliverability at each stage of the plan making process.

Sites within the South Downs National Park

- Mineral development no longer an attractive option for farmers/estates – public backlash and alternative uses now potentially more valuable.
- Park designated because of geology therefore it must acknowledge that minerals of value and national importance need to be extracted from inside the National Park.
- History tells us where the best sand is – in the National Park.
- Similar study to Surrey and Kent’s silica sand study needs to be undertaken.
- Any additional soft sand/silica sand studies will need to be park-wide.
- SDNPA Management Plan Policy 27 seen as negative towards minerals as it does not actually refer to development of’ or ‘extraction’ but rather ‘management and restoration of’.

Session 4: Safeguarding Mineral Resources and Infrastructure

Mineral resource safeguarding

- The Upper Greensand formation, as separate from the Folkstone formation may be the location of the silica sand resource. If this is the case (needs to be checked with British Geological Society, Mineral Products Association or neighbouring mineral planning authorities) it would be prudent to consider safeguarding this resource through an Mineral Safeguarding Area.
- It is important to identify a ‘protocol’ for inclusion in the MLP, to guide both district and boroughs and applicants through the Mineral Safeguarding Area/ Mineral Consultation Area policy and process- this could include a flow chart in the Plan, a planning guidance document, plus a clear policy on the Plan.
- Any MSA policy must include reference to prior extraction as an option for developers, subject to the usual controls, but should not require prior
extraction. The approach must reflect the viability of extraction, the proposed non mineral development and NPPF.

- Support for MCA boundary to follow the MSA boundary.
- Concerns about the Plan’s role in protecting mineral resources from encroachment from other development, such as housing.
- Support for MCA around specific site allocations or active sites, possibly extending 250m from the boundary.
- Discussion around need for extended MCA around allocated/active sites, to 400m – 500m concluded with the need for evidence to support such an approach as it is not common.
- The Plan should include a policy to enable the assessment of ‘windfall’ extraction sites. Such sites should then be covered by the MCA approach too.

**Mineral infrastructure safeguarding**

- Support for MCA around safeguarded infrastructure (wharves and railheads), possibly extending 250m from the boundary.
- The approach to wharf safeguarding at Shoreham Harbour was discussed, concluding that the Port Authority held the keys to supporting the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan whilst ensuring sufficient wharf capacity continued to be available.
- MLP approach to safeguarding in Littlehampton would need to be revisited in light of current evidence. The assumptions of the Wharves and Railhead Study 2014 and the draft interim position statement (2010) must be brought together with NPPF and current plans marina.
- The future usage of Littlehampton rail sidings (safeguarded in current MLP2003) for aggregate transport is limited by the absence of infrastructure such as a conveyor, which used to link the wharf/coated roadstone plant and railhead site. The railhead is not currently used for minerals and is unlikely to be, due to the absence of a conveyor.
- Current usage of Littlehampton Railway Wharf (safeguarded in MLP2003) could be reflected in new Plan, but this would need to be tempered against the aspirations for the Marina.
- A meeting and further evidence around the Littlehampton Marina/ Harbour Board and the MLP is needed in the short term.
## Appendix 1: Session Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Programme Item</th>
<th>Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30-10.00</td>
<td>Registration and refreshments 30 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.15</td>
<td>Welcome and introductory presentation: <strong>Joint Minerals Local Plan</strong> 15 mins</td>
<td>Darryl Hemmings, WSCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15-10.45</td>
<td><strong>Group Session 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals in West Sussex 30 mins</td>
<td>Group Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.15</td>
<td><strong>Group Session 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-aggregate minerals in West Sussex 30 mins</td>
<td>Group Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-11.45</td>
<td><strong>Group Session 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mineral Site Allocations for the Joint MLP 30 mins</td>
<td>Group Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45-12.15</td>
<td><strong>Group Session 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safeguarding mineral resources and infrastructure 30 mins</td>
<td>Group Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15-12.30</td>
<td>Next Steps for the MLP Q&amp;A 15 mins</td>
<td>Darryl Hemmings, WSCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Attendees

## Officers attending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Darryl Hemmings (Chair)</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transport Policy Manager (WSCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alethea Evans</td>
<td>Senior Planning Officer (WSCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rupy Sandhu</td>
<td>Planning Officer (WSCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Claire Potts</td>
<td>Minerals and Waste Manager (SDNPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Peter Wilsdon</td>
<td>Minerals and Waste Planning Officer (SDNPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Delegates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Richard Ford</td>
<td>Brett Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mark Kelly</td>
<td>Cemex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Andy Scott</td>
<td>Cemex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dave Norminton</td>
<td>Hanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ken Hobden</td>
<td>Mineral Products Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mark Russell</td>
<td>MPA/BMAPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Steve Tremlett</td>
<td>Brighton &amp; Hove City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Douglas Symes</td>
<td>D.K.Symes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lisa Kirby</td>
<td>Hampshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kate Matthews</td>
<td>Consultant-Day Group Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>John Prosser</td>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Simon Treacy</td>
<td>Lafarge-Tarmac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hannah Hyland</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nick Tennant</td>
<td>CLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lee Harrison (deputy harbour master)</td>
<td>Littlehampton Harbour Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nicola Jones (Clerk)</td>
<td>Littlehampton Harbour Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Neil Jay</td>
<td>Ibstock brickworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cllr Simon Oakley</td>
<td>West Sussex County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cllr John Rogers</td>
<td>West Sussex County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Stewart Mitchell</td>
<td>Grundon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Stephen Bowley</td>
<td>Consultant- Michelmersh Brick Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tony Cook</td>
<td>East Sussex County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Danny Trussler</td>
<td>Rabbit Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dave Walton</td>
<td>The Mineral Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Steve Dudman</td>
<td>Dudman Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Welcome & Apologies
1.1 The Chairman welcomed Sue Marsh and Ewan Coke to the meeting which would start with a presentation by Nat Percival to which London AWP representatives had been invited. He also thanked The Crown Estate for kindly providing the venue and hospitality. Apologies were received from Mark Chant (Milton Keynes), John Prosser (Kent CC), Ken Hobden (MPA), James Trimmer (PLA), Nick Tennant (DCLG) and Brianne Stolper (LB Hillingdon).

2 Marine Management Organisation (MMO) Presentation
2.1 Nat Percival spoke to a presentation on the implications of section 58 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, the MMO’s current approach to implementation and monitoring, and steps to engage external decision makers. Most of the presentation was on the East Coast Plans. The South Coast Plans are at an early stage with workshops in July to focus on...

2.2 In response to questions NP said:
- ‘exceptional circumstances’ in the aggregate policies reflected that government priorities, perhaps for oil & gas exploration, might override the aggregate activities.
- local authorities should consult the MMO if a wharf that imported aggregates was threatened with closure from redevelopment; this applied whether the wharf adjoined the sea area supplying the aggregate or not. The MMO would respond to the consultation.
- the East Coast Plan areas have extensive energy related interests; the South Coast sea areas include more diverse activities, including more social and leisure interests. However, the principles are the same and he recognised that industry is seeking a consistency of approach for aggregates throughout the sea areas.
- it is recognised that there are significant gaps in the evidence base in the South Coast Plan areas. The MMO is seeking to close these gaps, and has targeted priorities.

2.3 The Chairman thanked NP for the presentation and commended the MMO in successfully gaining the Secretary of State’s approval of the East Coast Plans in such a short time. NP agreed to provide a copy of the presentation to be issued with the minutes of the meeting.

3 Minutes and Matters Arising from 13 November 2013 meeting

3.1 Matters raised, other than those to be dealt with under an agenda item, were as follows:

2.1 3.1 The Secretary would put Draft on the minutes until they were cleared, and MPA’s would only put them on their web sites when they were cleared.

3.6 3.23 The responses to 7 Local Aggregate Assessments (LAAs) were sent and circulated.

6.1 The draft minute had been amended. The Chairman asked EM to pass on SEEAWP’s best wishes for Mark Plummer in his new role with DCLG in housing.

6.6 The Annual Monitoring Report for 2012 was finalised, issued and placed on the DCLG website.

4 Marine Aggregates

4.1 SEEAWP 14/02 reported on The Crown Estate’s publication Marine Aggregates – Capability & Portfolio 2013. This sets out the tonnage of current primary aggregate reserves in each of the seven sea regions, the 10 year and 3 year average annual offtake, and compares this with the annual permitted offtake. The Secretary drew attention to figures of significance to the South East, including that at the average offtake in the last 3 years, reserves would last for some 13 years. He considered that the particular merit of the publication is that for the first time it provides a perspective on marine aggregates comparable to land based data. It is intended to be produced annually and MPAs can draw on it in their section on marine aggregate supply in their LAAs.
4.2 NE said that he would welcome feedback on the document and confirmed that it would be produced annually. There had been a number of licences granted in 2013, so the figures for that year would show an increased level of reserves. A number of those at the meeting had not seen the document; NE would provide the link to access it on the website, and those that had not received a copy should advise NE so he could ensure a full distribution of future documents.

http://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/energy-and-infrastructure/aggregates/

5 AM2013 Draft Report

5.1 The Secretary introduced the AM2013 draft report which had been circulated. He thanked industry and MPAs for making the necessary returns, and AE for her assistance with the figures. The report still needed tidying in terms of pagination, page headings etc. The Secretary said that he had identified some errors that needed amending, and had received some corrections from East Sussex to paragraphs 4.4, 9.1 and the tables and appendices. These identified the two areas in which the Secretary particularly asked SEEAWP to review. Would any of the data in the Tables reveal a confidential figure? Were the paragraphs on Local Plans and LAAs accurate?

5.2 A number of changes were proposed to the draft:

TC and CP would forward corrections to the appendices on sites in E Sussex or SDNPA.

SM asked for paragraph 3.4 to be amended as sales had been stable over the last 5 years

The Chairman asked for the footnote to Table 7 to be deleted as it was superfluous

DP said that LAAs do not propose figures – this was for Local Plans. PC agreed, paragraph 9.2 should be amended.

PC, AE and others said that Core Strategies should no longer be referred to. AE offered to draft a revision to paragraph 9.1

CP asked for paragraph 8.1 to state whether the figures related to active or both active and inactive quarries

TC asked for ‘except East Sussex’ to be deleted from the second sentence in paragraph 9.3

5.3 It was agreed that subject to these changes, and any further amendments sent to the Secretary by 25 July, the Chairman and Secretary be authorised to finalise AM2013, including figures to support the tables, issue it, and ask for DCLG and MPAs to place it on their websites.

6 DCLG Update

6.1 Eamon Mythen reported that DCLG minerals and waste team now had a full staff complement, with Nick Tennant now team leader, and would move to former Home Office accommodation in Marsham St in July & August. He hoped any service disruption would be minimal. There had been no recent Ministerial changes.

DCLG’s website had been updated to include all AWP Secretary contacts and 2012 monitoring reports (except for the West Midlands which is producing the 2011 & 2012 reports together), and will include 2013 reports when they are all available.
Annual Minerals Raised Inquiry: clearance had been obtained for ONS to undertake the 2014 survey. A request to proceed was now before Nick Boles

National 4 Yearly Aggregate Minerals Survey: a number of internal hurdles had been cleared and a bid was to be made to Nick Boles for permission to seek tenders. This would be for the 2013 calendar year in order to maintain continuity in the 4 yearly data series required by industry, planners and AWPs in analysing and interpreting data. To avoid confusion DCLG agreed to term this AM13 in line with past practice and not AM14.

Planning Guidance (NPPG) issued on line 6 March, would have a number of additions relevant to minerals planning - on peat; underground coal gasification; and underground storage of natural gas. New planning policy on waste management would also be issued, replacing PPS10. Timing: summer 2014.

Permitted Development Rights: a consultation in the summer would include proposed retail use class changes, greater flexibility for changes to residential use, some exemptions for waste management site operational facilities and minor developments in support of businesses. Minerals would not be directly affected.

Onshore Oil & Gas: DCLG had delivered the planning component of the wider regulatory framework. DECC was now consulting on its proposals (announced on 23 May, consultation closing on 12 August) to simplify underground access for shale gas and deep geothermal operations. Local people would receive notification, but property owners or tenants would not have to be consulted on or give permission for operations below 300m under their land. Provision would be made for a voluntary payment of £20,000 per lateral well to the local community. Implementation would be through the Infrastructure Bill.

Public Health England had published a report on public health impacts of exposure to chemical and radioactive pollutants as a result of shale gas extraction. (NB: the naturally occurring radioactive aspects are common to all oil and gas drilling, not unique to shale gas). Infrastructure Bill would transform the Highways Agency into a government owned company and simplify the procedures for nationally significant infrastructure.

BIS Select Committee, Extractive Industries Sector: the Minister had asked why government does not have a minerals strategy.

DfT was allocating £168 million for pothole prevention & repair across England.

Brownfield land: to bring forward development a £5 million fund was to be launched to support LDOs with a target of putting 90% of sites suitable for housing into production by 2020. In addition, £400 million was to be spent on promoting 20 new housing zones in London, and £200 million on 10 zones outside London.

Revised EIA Directive: the text had been published in the Official Journal on 25 April, dropping proposals for extending its application. No decisions had been made yet on how the Directive would be transposed by the due date May 2017.

Hampshire CC Oil & Gas Information Day: some 200 delegates attended this very informative event in Winchester. The purpose was to explain to those attending what exploration and extraction would actually entail before any proposals were submitted. Professor Sanderson from Southampton University had been particularly helpful in presenting facts about hydraulic fracturing, demystifying misconceptions. EM felt that the day had raised three key issues

- the need for more factual information to counter misinformation
- armed with bad examples of poor regulatory practice in the USA, public cynicism that the government’s regulatory framework would be effective and protect communities
- clarification of the scale of activities and cumulative impacts eg could the 3 current sites in Hampshire become 10 or 100?

The Chairman asked if there would be a note of the day’s proceedings. PC said that Hants CC were preparing a report. He would send the web link for the Secretary to circulate.
A summary report has now been published on the County Council website:
http://www3.hants.gov.uk/minerals/oil-gas-development.htm

Cuadrilla had submitted the first planning applications for an exploration site and a series of associated monitoring stations in south Lancashire. If permission was granted it proposed to drill, hydraulically fracture and test flow of gas from up to four exploratory wells and monitor before and after operations.

7 Local Aggregate Assessments (LAAs)

7.1 SEEAWP 14/03 proposed that the Autumn SEEAWP meeting should focus on LAAs updated with the AM2013 figures once the report was finalised and issued. This was agreed, with updated LAAs to be submitted to SEEAWP no later than 2 weeks before the meeting in order that they could be circulated in advance. The Chairman asked that wherever possible LAAs should be submitted earlier than this. SEEAWP agreed this would avoid members suddenly receiving up to 11 LAAs all at once.

7.2 LH questioned whether this was practical as his authority had taken six months to agree the draft LAA. PD said that the timetable for internal signing off by an authority was a separate matter - the submissions to SEEAWP should be made as agreed.

7.3 PS said that it was difficult to get to the essence of an LAA without reading it all. He asked that LAAs should contain an executive summary of no more than an A4 page. This was strongly supported by SEEAWP. BS suggested that if the LAA update was essentially the same format as the previous LAA, but just updating the figures, track changes in the updated version would be most helpful.

7.4 In response to the Chairman SM said that the East of England AWP invited each authority to introduce the LAA at its meetings. The Chairman felt that with 11 LAAs that would be likely to lead to too long a SEEAWP meeting. SEEAWP agreed that it would be content with an LAA summary of A4 length or less.

7.5 The checklist for LAAs, which SEEAWP had not adopted, but agreed would provide something of an ‘aide memoire’ was reported to this meeting at the request of Lester Harrington. LH said he maintained concerns that it could lead to SEEAWP criticising a draft Bucks LAA by asking for more than was required. SEEAWP did not share this view and considered that the checklist was useful. TC reported that the POS/mpa guide is in its final draft form. He intends to carry out consultations on this and provide a copy for next SEEAWP meeting.

8 Any Other Business

Silica Sand

8.1 At the last meeting the Chairman asked MPAs with silica sand resources to draw up a definition. SEEAWP 14/04 set out two definitions, one long, one short. PS and SM pointed out that the long definition in SEEAWP 14/04 was almost word for word the definition in the BGS Fact Sheet – but not quite. Although the short definition was useful, the meeting preferred to stick to the BGS definition in its Mineral Planning Fact Sheet. For clarity, this is:

“Silica (industrial) sands contain a high proportion of silica (normally more than 95% SiO2) and are used for applications other than as construction aggregates. They are produced from both loosely consolidated sand deposits and by crushing weakly cemented sandstones. Unlike construction sands, which are used for their physical properties alone, silica sands are...
valued for a combination of chemical and physical properties. These include a high silica content in the form of quartz and, more importantly, very low levels of deleterious impurities, particularly clay, iron oxides and refractory minerals, such as chromite. They typically have a narrow grain size distribution (generally in the range 0.5 to 0.1mm).

For most applications, silica sands have to conform to very closely defined specifications, and consistency in quality is of critical importance. Particular uses often require different combinations of properties. Consequently different grades of silica sand are usually not interchangeable in use. Silica sands command higher prices than construction sands. This allows them to serve a wider geographical market, including exports”.

8.2 AE said that silica sand, despite its properties was not always used for glass making, and it was not clear why a ten year landbank was required if the sand was being put to a lower value recreational use. PC said that Hants CC had experience of reviewing landbanks for different types of sand and would send this to AE.

West Sussex Joint Minerals Plan

8.3 Alethea Evans said that the LAA and Wharves and Railhead Study for the Joint West Sussex Minerals Plan had been completed in February 2014. The work is now attempting to quantify the possible demand for minerals from key aggregate reliant investment. The assistance of SEEAWP, focusing on MPAs initially, would be appreciated.

AE has supplied a note setting this out in more detail as attached to the minutes.

Aggregate Survey Returns and Confidentiality

8.4 Paul Sanderson said that the South East Minerals Planning officers had discussed the mpa advice note dated 6 March 2014 to AWP and RAWP Secretaries on Aggregate Survey Returns and confidentiality. The advice was generally welcomed, but it appears to need some amendments. PD and other MPA officers supported this, particularly regarding point 5. A minerals authority would seek the views of the individual supplier, but not seek permission, as the decision whether to release survey information to the public or in un-collated form, perhaps in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, lay with the authority. PS agreed to write to mpa on the suggested amendments.

9 Date of Next Meeting

9.1 The next SEEAWP meeting is to take place at 2pm on Wednesday 22 October 2014 at Venue to be confirmed

Will MPAs please note that this means updated LAAs should be submitted to the Secretary at the latest by 8 October, and preferably before the end of September.
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1. Welcome & Apologies

1.1 The Chairman welcomed Lisa Kirby and Peter Wilsdon to the meeting. Apologies were received from Lester Hannington (Bucks CC), Peter Chadwick (Hants CC), Claire Potts (S Downs NPA), Alan Everard and Ken Hobden (MPA), Nick Tennant (DCLG) and Sue Marsh (EoE AWP).

2. Minutes and Matters Arising from 9 July meeting

2.1 2.2 An amendment was agreed as proposed by Phil McBryde of MMO:

- local authorities should consult the MMO if a proposed activity was to take place below mean high water springs, such as a wharf that imported aggregate was threatened from closure from development.; this applies whether the wharf adjoins the sea area supplying the aggregate or not. The MMO would respond to the consultation and would advise if a marine licence was required.

4.2 No further requests had been made by SEEAWP to NE for the Capability and Portfolio document.
5.3 AM2013 had been amended, issued and sent to DCLG

7.5 The POS/MPA Guide was subject of a further draft, and would be issued in due course.

3 LAAs

3.1 The Chairman asked the Secretary to introduce paper SEEAWP 14/05, and to comment on whether the LAA updates raised any issues at the regional level. The Secretary thanked the 11 MPAs which had submitted updated LAAs. He considered that the LAAs were of a high standard, and that in many cases the depth and breadth of the assessments provided just about everything one needed to know about aggregates in an MPA area. All the LAAs were comprehensive in covering alternative materials, imports and exports, and land-won workings, and had used AM2013 data. It was pleasing to see MMO and Crown Estate documents being referred to, and the importance of safeguarding wharves and rail depots. Local Plan figures and those proposed in the updated LAAs confirmed the AM2013 summary that, with figures well in excess of the 10 and 3 year averages, the region was proposing to make a full contribution to national and local needs.

3.2 The report SEEAWP 14/05 also drew attention to Kent saying it would not be able to maintain a 7 year landbank for sharp sands and gravel beyond 2017, and resources could be exhausted by 2024; and neighbouring Surrey saying there was little prospect of additional sites beyond those in their Minerals Plan. This raised the issue as to how a shortfall within the Plan period might be met - potentially by an increased supply of marine dredged material or by cross boundary movements of land-won sand and gravel, ideally from within the region.

3.3 The Chairman suggested that those LAAs over which members had issues should be dealt with after those which were not contentious. SEEAWP agreed, and on this basis **Bucks, Hants, Isle of Wight, Medway, Milton Keynes and Oxfordshire LAAs** were dealt with first. SEEAWP approved these LAAs, and only detailed matters were raised seeking clarity or corrections to certain figures. A number of the points were agreed at the meeting, or were to be dealt with in correspondence rather than as a SEEAWP view. The other LAAs were then considered in turn, and again detailed matters were raised in addition to the views given below, and were agreed or to be dealt with in correspondence (a note on such points and a response from members of the East of England AWP is attached).

**Berkshire (including West Berkshire)**

3.4 SC was concerned that no separate provision was being proposed for soft sand. Industry recognised that there were constraints to workings, but it might be more sustainable to accept a quarry in an AONB rather than truck the sand over longer distances. MM said that no separate figure for soft sand had been shown in the LAA in order to maintain confidentiality, there being only one active site in West Berks. However, he was well aware of the need for soft sand. Discussions had been held with Oxfordshire and would also take place with Hants.

3.5 SC and DP also raised concerns on the wider issue of whether the region wide provision being proposed for soft sand would meet the needs of the region or lead to imports from further afield. The Secretary sought an assurance from those MPAs with only one or two soft sand sites, that they were working to a figure for which provision was needed even if they could not set this out in the LAA for reasons of confidentiality. He would look at soft sand sales over the last 10 years and compare this with the provision now being proposed.
Industry noted West Berkshire’s steps in preparation for a Minerals Plan, but were concerned that there appeared to be no such proposals by the other 5 Berkshire Unitary Authorities. MW said that no agreement had been reached on a joint Local Plan. He would consult colleagues in the other 4 authorities and would report back to the Secretary.

**East Sussex**

SM said that the LAA did not include a 10 year average figure, and he asked for this to be included. TC said that sales had been volatile and for a number of years there had been no sales in East Sussex. Accordingly it was not felt appropriate to rely on this figure. However, he agreed to amend the LAA by including it.

**Kent**

DP said that industry were concerned that, as SEEAWP 14/05 reported, Kent had flagged up a shortfall for sharp sands and gravel within the Plan period. The AWP needed to address how this shortfall could be met. Moreover, although the region wide 10 year average may currently allow for a growth in aggregate demand, it will not do so in a few years time. From its national figures of increasing sales mpa predict a crossover early in the Plan period.

**Surrey**

DP said that a similar issue applied to Surrey, where a shortfall in supply was forecast to take place at or near the end of the Plan period. Surrey 2014 LAA expected the shortfall to be made up by aggregates from Bucks and Hants. Were those MPAs content with this and making appropriate provision? TC said that the issue was as much for the MPAs to resolve under the duty to cooperate as for the AWP.

The Chairman agreed that how an aggregate shortfall might be met from within or without the region was an important issue which needed further attention. Picking up on the points recorded in paragraph 3.5 above, he recognised that the concerns of DP and SC were potentially of regional significance, but arose from measures designed to protect the commercially sensitive information of individual companies. He therefore asked whether it would be possible for SEEAWP to prepare a non-statutory addendum setting out the regional details for soft sand in particular, but also maybe for sharp sand and for aggregate as a whole. For soft sand, for example, the addendum might cover that part of the region for which LAAs had not specified a provision for soft sand. By combining data from more than one MPA area confidentiality criteria could be met. It was agreed that this would be welcome, and industry representatives noted that this would need the cooperation of their colleagues. DP and the Secretary would gather data and prepare a report for the next meeting. The Chairman also suggested that this was an appropriate item for the next AWP Secretaries meeting and NCG to identify whether there were similar issues elsewhere in the country.

**West Sussex**

AE said that the current LAA for W Sussex, including the S Downs National Park was published in February 2014. An updated LAA had not been produced as work had focussed on early engagement on the evidence base for the new Mineral Local Plan. This included a call for sites, publishing 5 Background Papers, holding two targeted engagement events and publishing a Mineral Sites Study. Work on a revised LAA was now underway. It was anticipated that the draft LAA would be published for consultation with SEEAWP members and others in January 2015.
SEEAWP Response to LAAs

3.12 The Secretary drew attention to a potential source of confusion in that although most of the updated LAAs were titled LAA 2014, or just LAA but with the 2014 month on the cover, some were dated LAA 2013 or LAA 2004-2013. Whilst each MPA seeks to have a logically consistent sequence of dating its own documents, collations and comparisons between LAAs which were contemporary but dated differently could be misleading and lead to inaccuracies. He asked whether it would be possible for all the current updated LAAs to be dated 2014. Some MPA representatives anticipated problems in achieving this, nevertheless it was felt to be a worthwhile objective.

3.13 It was agreed that the Secretary would send one response to all 11 LAAs saying that SEEAWP approved the updated drafts. The MPA officers’ attention would be drawn to the minutes of this meeting at which the drafts were discussed, particularly the wider issues regarding provision for soft sand, and movement of aggregate across MPA boundaries to overcome shortfalls. Assistance would be sought to aid in reporting on these issues at the next SEEAWP meeting.

4 Marine Aggregates

4.1 The absence of an MMO representative was regretted. MR said he would ask MMO for a written progress report.

4.2 MR reported on one of the three MMO Workshops on the Vision and Objectives for the South Coast Plans. He understood that the next stage would be for consultation on Options in the first half of 2015, with the Draft Plans consultation later in 2015. The issues in the South Coast Plans area are different from those of the East Coast, with a greater intensity of relationships at the coast, including at the ports and with a much higher level of recreation both in the sea and on land at the coast. MMO have subsequently confirmed the following timeline for the production of the South Coast Plans: Options - Winter/Spring 2015, Policy development – Spring/Summer 2015, Public Consultation Draft – Winter 2015-2016

4.2 The 2014 edition of the Crown Estate Capability and Portfolio document is in its final stage before publication. This would include 15 year licence renewals that had significantly increased the marine reserves. The 16th Annual Report ‘The Area Involved’ and the ‘Marine Aggregates Dredging 1998-2012’ A 15 Year Review by the Crown Estate and BMAPA have also been published at http://www.bmapa.org/documents/BMAPA_16th_Annual_Report.pdf

5 DCLG Update

5.1 Nick Tennant had sent apologies and was unable to attend. The Secretary would attach a DCLG update note from Eamon Mythen with the minutes – see attached.

5.2 The Secretary reported that at an AWP Secretaries meeting on 3 October NT said that DCLG would start the tendering process for the National Aggregate Survey as soon as possible with a view to the contractor starting in January 2015. The notice had been published with responses sought by 31 October. The contractor would arrange training
sessions for MPA staff. DCLG intended to consult UK Minerals Forum and POS about undertaking the survey for the calendar year 2014.

5.3 In response to PD, the Secretary said that the AWP Secretaries had unanimously supported the 4 year survey to cover the 2014 calendar year. Data from a 2013 national survey would not be available until late 2015 at the earliest. AWPs had already undertaken an annual survey for 2013 to provide up to date data for LAAs and Local Plans. If the National Survey did cover the 2013 year, industry would be faced with two surveys starting in January 2015, that survey and the normal 2014 survey by the AWP Secretaries ie two concurrent surveys, but confusingly covering two different years.

5.4 DCLG recognized that new contracts for AWP Secretaries needed to be put in place from 1 April 2015, and is considering the potential for the contracts to be on a 3 year rolling basis.

5.5 Much of the WP Secretaries meeting was focused on a draft paper for NCG drawing out the conclusions from the various AWP AM reports. What issues are being faced, such as incomplete data, lack of cooperation by MPAs with the AWP, or delay in provision of LAAs or Local Plans? Were the regions making a full contribution to both national and local aggregate needs? An NCG meeting is to be scheduled for Spring 2015.

6 Any Other Business

6.1 PW asked if SEEAWP knew of suitable training aimed at ensuring the health a safety of planning officers visiting quarries? He was advised to contact the Institute of Quarrying, one or more of the planning schools or perhaps to simply ask a local operator for a tour of a quarry to let new staff experience a quarry excavation site.

6.2 AE thanked those authorities which had provided data to assist W Sussex in its additional aggregate forecasting work. This sought to address the ‘other relevant information’ aspect of the NPPF, looking beyond ‘10 years average sales’ to consider some additional variables such as economic growth and possible changes in future supply options. An early draft of a report has been used to underpin engagement with East Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council. This engagement had revealed the need to include an additional scenario to explore the possible future aggregate supply and demand influences in East Sussex, particularly in respect of possible changing land won supplies. The report would be finalised in December/January. It is anticipated that this will be subject to informal engagement prior to the publication of the draft Plan scheduled for autumn 2015. Due to the technical nature of the report, it was likely that engagement in early 2015 would be targeted towards the minerals industry.

6.3 The Chairman reminded SEEAWP that some two years ago, both he and the Secretary said they would retire from their current roles in two years time. That date was fast approaching, as both intended to step down after the next meeting. SEEAWP were asked, between now and the next meeting to consider who might chair SEEAWP from that date. The Secretary replacement would stem from whoever succeeds in a bid for the DCLG contract.
6.4 The Chairman thanked PS for both making the arrangements and agreeing that Surrey CC would pay for the meeting room and refreshments for this meeting. It was unfortunate that DCLG could no longer offer accommodation. He asked others to commit their authority to a meeting, the cost of which was some £400 +VAT, plus the refreshments. AE offered to make arrangements and for West Sussex CC to cover the cost. This was gladly accepted. The industry representatives said that mpa and BAA might contribute to costs, but could not offer a venue as this would give the wrong image to the public. It was also suggested that The Crown Estate might host a meeting.

7 Date of Next Meeting

7.1 It was agreed that subject to a venue being available, the next meeting would be at 2pm on Wednesday 25 February 2015. However, subsequently AE has found that this date is not available. The next SEEAWP meeting will be at 2pm on Tuesday 24 February at Local Government House, Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ.
SI06: SEEAWP Minutes (23/02/15)
Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 23 February 2015
at Local Government House, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ

Present:
John Kilford    Chairman
Matt Meldrum    West Berks   Mark Worringham   Reading
Ian Church      Windsor & Maidenhead. Vanessa Rowell Wokingham
Lester Hannington Bucks CC Tony Cook E Sussex CC
Bryan Geake     Kent CC Claire Potts S Downs NPA
Catherine Smith Medway Peter Day Oxfordshire CC
Paul Sanderson  Surrey CC Rupy Sandhu W Sussex CC
Chris Mills     Isle of Wight Laura Davidson Milton Keynes
Bob Smith       MPA Richard Ford MPA
Stewart Mitchell MPA David Payne MPA
Mark Russell    BMAPA Steve Cole BAA
Nick Everington The Crown Estate Eamon Mythen DCLG
Chris Waite     Technical Secretary

1 Welcome & Apologies
1.1 The Chairman welcomed those who were new to the meeting. Apologies were received from Lisa Kirby (Hampshire), Simon Treacy (MPA) and Sue Marsh (EEAWP).

2 Minutes and Matters Arising from 27 October 2014 meeting

Minutes:
Following discussions with Surrey, DP proposed an amendment to the first three sentences of paragraph 3.9. This would now read: DP said that a similar issue applied to Surrey, where a shortfall in supply of sharp sand and gravel was forecast to take place at or near the end of the Plan period. The South East as a whole, together with Buckinghamshire and Hampshire had significant sharp sand and gravel resources. Surrey 2014 LAA expected to continue to import land won sharp sand and gravel from other authorities within the region for the foreseeable future. Surrey and SEEAWP agreed this amendment.
Matters Arising not dealt with under other agenda items:

2.1 TC said that there was now an agreed draft of the POS/MPA LAA Guide. This would now be prepared for the web and copies would be circulated to AWP representatives via the Secretary.

8.4 PS said that the points he had raised with mpa regarding their Note on Confidentiality and Survey Returns had been resolved. He would send a note to the Secretary to circulate to the AWP.

3.4 MM reported that discussions with adjoining MPAs on provision for soft sand, including Wiltshire were on going. A resolution would take place in the W Berks Minerals & Waste Plan.

3.6 MW said that he had replied to the Secretary. Four of the Berkshire authorities were still discussing whether they might prepare a joint plan. Slough had declined to take part.

3.12 In response to the Chairman all authorities agreed that LAAs would be titled the same year as covered by the survey.

3.13 The Secretary confirmed that he had sent letters to each MPA as agreed by SEEAWP, and a copy of one to mpa and BAA for information.

5.2 EM said that in response to DCLG consultation, UKMF and POS supported the National Survey to cover 2014. BGS had finally been authorised this month to undertake the survey. He would be contacting Jo Mankelow this week to establish the BGS programme to get the survey up and running. The procedures would be the same as in previous years, including forming a Steering Group, and he anticipated that the survey forms would be the same as last time. He understood that SEEAWP was concerned for the forms to be issued as soon as possible. EM confirmed that the following national survey would be for 2017 in order to return to the 4 year cycle.

3 West Sussex & Kent Draft LAAs

West Sussex draft LAA

3.1 The draft LAA had been circulated by the Secretary. He reported that the coverage of the LAA was comprehensive, including an assessment of aggregate requirements to 2031 based on the 10 year average using the latest 2004-2013 data. The LAA had also taken local circumstances into account, including to the extent of recognising that three of the five existing Minerals Plan allocations were undeliverable. Future allocations for aggregates would need to consider the implications of the South Downs National Park designation.

3.2 CP said that to assist forward planning, a study by consultants had been commissioned jointly by East and West Sussex, Hampshire and the SDNPA. This was due to report in April.

3.3 SM drew attention to Table 8 in the LAA which showed for 2012 and 2013 combined, 1Mt more sales than marine aggregate landings. What was the reason for this? RS said that he had also been concerned at the level of change and was investigating with the operators and The Crown Estate whether the figures were correct, or whether there had been double counting. He would advise the Secretary when this was resolved so the AWP could be informed.

3.4 The Secretary was asked to write to West Sussex approving the draft.
Kent draft LAA

3.5 The revised draft had simply updated data and had been circulated. However, one company in Kent considers that a substantial proportion of its soft sand reserves, some 4Mt, should be reclassified as silica sand. BG said that this was now before the Inspector who would hold the public Examination into the Kent Minerals Plan. If confirmed, this would reduce the reserves of mortar and building sand, and would be reflected in the 2015 LAA.

3.6 PD asked why the sand and gravel figures did not include hoggin and bulk fill? BG said that this was to be clearer on the good quality aggregate needs. However, he recognised the LAA did not identify the amount of hoggin & bulk fill, and that this was out of step with other LAAs and the AM reports.

3.7 CP asked whether Kent could establish the export figures to SE counties, breaking down the ‘rest of the South East’ grouping. BG was advised that he might be able to obtain this if he contacted Jo Mankelow at BGS who oversaw the 2009 survey.

3.8 SC said that the potential change in the reserves of soft sand was so large, the LAA needed ‘a health warning’ and proposed the following recommendation. ‘Whilst SEEAWP planned to approve the factual changes in the draft LAA, it recognises that this is subject to change at the Public Examination into the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan’. SEEAWP agreed the recommendation.

3.9 In response to the Chairman, West Sussex and Kent agreed that they, together with all other SEEAWP MPAs, would submit 2015 LAAs to the Autumn SEEAWP meeting.

4 Marine Aggregates

Marine Aggregates – Capability & Portfolio 2014

4.1 The Secretary said that the latest Capability and Portfolio by The Crown Estate had good news for this region as, due to licenses granted in the last 12 months, the reserves of primary aggregates had been increased to over 20 years at the average off take of the last 10 years. The report provides valuable data for MPAs in drawing up their LAAs.

South Coast Plans: Options Workshops

4.2 The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) had organised three Workshops on the Options report which had been circulated to SEEAWP. Several SEEAWP representatives had attended one or other of the workshops. All had found the exercises that MMO asked to be completed on the day complicated, and it was difficult to come to conclusions on the options presented. These had been drafted so they were distinct, but in doing so lost some credibility and included inconsistencies. TC said that the key problem was that draft policies were absent from the presentations. The representatives at the workshops were asked to comment on the narrative and objectives without seeing what policies would emerge.

4.3 MR said that the Options were only part of the process leading up to the draft Plans. He considered that in a number of areas the MMO was going beyond the powers of a Marine Plan and that the only policy option that would be acceptable to government would be the flexible option. He had three main points:

- policy wording needed to be consistent across the Plan areas. This would be important when the adjoining Thames Plans were prepared.
one option was proposing greater weight of protection for aggregate exploration/option areas than for marine licence/applications areas. This needed to be corrected.

- MMO need to reconsider its proposed sustainability approach that would weigh one user, including aggregates, against another. Was this appropriate for a Marine Plan?

4.4 SEEAWP agreed to make a response to MMO as drawn up by MR on the basis of the above. He would draft it this week, which would enable the Secretary to circulate, including to the London AWP for their agreement as a joint response.

5 Soft Sand; Intra-regional Movement of Aggregate; Overall Supply

5.1 At the October meeting industry representatives expressed concern as to whether sufficient provision was being made for soft sands, and whether MPAs were paying sufficient attention to meeting the anticipated shortfalls arising from the imbalance in reserves and resources in the west and east of the region.

Soft Sand

The Secretary wrote to those MPAs which did not have specific figures for soft sand in their 2014 LAA assessments to ask in confidence for a soft sand figure. He sought to establish whether these MPAs were making provision for 0.2mtpa, which in addition to the 1.6mtpa specified together in 4 LAAs, would meet the 1.8mtpa regional 10 year sales average. SEEAWP 15/03 set out the results. Although a number of MPAs had no soft sand resource or produced a very low level of sales, principally from sharp sand and gravel sites, the authorities that had not specified a figure were together proposing to provide for at least 0.2mtpa.

Location of Supplies and Intra-regional Movement

5.2 The LAA assessments show a shortage of sharp sand and gravel supplies in the east of the region, including Kent and Surrey, whereas the reverse is the case for soft sand supplies, 70% of which are in Kent and Surrey (however this resource may be reduced - see paragraph 3.5 above). LAAs have had regard to circumstances in neighbouring authorities, and have emphasised the opportunity for marine supplies and recycled material to assist in making up a shortfall, rather than land-won imports from other SE authorities.

Overall Provision

5.3 In correspondence on the above, DP had sent the Secretary an outline of mpa national land-won forecast of sales, which suggested that sales might be some 61Mt by 2016. This implied a 20% increase 2011-2016 which was not the experience in the SE where sales had continued to decline. However, even if this forecast was optimistic the Secretary pointed out that with a lower growth figure sales could soon exceed the 10 year average as the years before the recession would no longer be in the calculation.

5.4 SC said that although soft sand comprised a small part of the land-won aggregate sales, sufficient flexibility should be available to meet a sudden and significant upturn in demand. He cited Dorset where soft sand sales are now above the 10 year average. He also considered that the principle of local supply being met by local materials should be more heavily weighed in identifying new provision. There needs to be a balance struck protecting a National Park and the impact of transport from east to west or vice versa across the region.
5.5 DP said that the mpa forecast was for all aggregates (ie not separating out marine and land-won sources). In response to PD he said that the forecast could be made available to SEEAWP. EM said that AMRI 2013 figures showed a marked increase in sales, some 35%, together with increased employment figures in the industry.

5.6 PD disagreed with the Secretary’s report which said that the cross over of sales exceeding the 10 years average would have implications for NPPG and the basis of LAA assessments. PD considered that at that stage the 10 years average remained the starting point for LAAs, with the consideration of other relevant local information having a larger part to play. DP agreed, and said that the 3 year average would also have more significance. TC said that as LAAs were taken forward year by year they would be better able to analyse demand/need as land won sales were only part of the total picture. LH said that MPAs are required to cooperate in preparing Local Plans and therefore evidence would need to be provided to support any reliance on supplies from adjoining authorities.

5.7 SEEAWP agreed with the Chairman’s summary that the issue of soft sand provision would become clearer as Local Plans progressed, that SEEAWP could not influence intra-regional movements at present, and both situations needed to be monitored.

6 DCLG Update

6.1 EM reported that:
AMRI for 2013 would be published on 27 February and put on the web. This showed an upsurge in demand and employment in the industry. AMRI for 2014 was to be initiated and steps were being taken to extend the contracts to 2015 and beyond.
AWP Secretary contracts would be for 3 years with a one year break clause to reflect annual spending reviews. OJEU competitive tenders had been delayed but are expected after one more clearance. The purdah period (from 31 March) and outcome of the General Election would not affect appointments. There would be a period when no Secretaries would be in post between 31 March and perhaps May when the contracts are planned to be awarded. He recognized that unless BGS was able to start the process including issuing the survey forms in March, then the national survey would not progress until May.
NCG meeting: discussions were to be held this week whether to have a meeting before or post the Election.

7 Chairman of SEEAWP

7.1 The Chairman reminded members that this would be his last meeting. Had SEEAWP decided on a new Chairman for future meetings? PD said that discussions had been held, and ideally an independent Chairman with experience such as held by the current Chairman would be preferred. But no such replacement had been identified. He proposed that Tony Cook be elected Chairman. TC said he was happy to take on this role, on condition that the situation was reviewed in a years time. SEEAWP thanked TC for accepting the post and he was elected Chairman.

8 Any Other Business

8.1 On behalf of SEEAWP, TC thanked JK for the cordial way in which he had acted as Chairman, and thanked him for the time and interest that he had taken in fulfilling the role over a number of years. JK said that he had enjoyed the role, and was pleased at how
SEEAWP had reached agreement by consensus, and a way forward had been agreed over issues on which there were differing views.

8.2 Similarly TC thanked the Secretary for his role in organising meetings and providing efficient minutes. JK also thanked the Secretary on whom he had depended in keeping in touch and preparing for the meetings.

9 Date of Next Meeting

9.1 TC was keen for a date for the next meeting to be placed in diaries. The Secretary reminded SEEAWP that The Crown Estate had offered to host the next meeting with the intention to have a presentation by MMO officers on the South Coast Plans to both SEEAWP and London AWP, as had been done in July last year on the East Coast Plans. It was understood that the writing up and assessment of views taken at the Options Workshops would be completed in May, and MMO would then move forward to preparing the first draft of the Plans. Russell Gadbury was happy to make a presentation as proposed. Although MMO could not specify an appropriate date, SEEAWP agreed that a July date was likely to be most suitable. NE agreed to let TC know dates in July on which the large Crown Estate conference room would be available. TC would select a date and advise the Secretary so he could include in the minutes.

Post Meeting Note: proposed next meeting of SEEAWP – Wednesday 15 July 2015, 2pm at The Crown Estate Office.
Dear Claire

Thank you for your email of 11 September 2015, I hope that the following answers will be of assistance.

**Q1. Current Position on Silica Sand**
The last operational silica sand quarry in County Durham was Weatherhill Quarry which was located to the north of Stanhope in Weardale. This quarry closed during 2011 and extraction has now permanently ceased.

For many years this sand was mainly used to optimise the chemistry of the feed for the manufacture of cement at the nearby Eastgate Cement Works which itself closed in 2002. Information previously provided to the County Council in response to the Council's survey of mineral operators indicated that sales from Weatherhill Quarry were very low (approximately 500 tonnes per annum) in recent years and that reserves were very extensive. Unfortunately, no permitted reserve figure is available from the previous operator. It is understood that up until its closure in 2011 the site served local markets mainly in the North East of England.

In addition to Weatherhill Quarry there are also two dormant silica sand planning permissions under the Environment Act 1995.Viewly Hill (High Stoop Quarry) near Wolsingham which was last worked in 1956 and Houselop Beck Quarry near Wolsingham which was last worked in the 1960s. These are both very old permissions dating from 1953 and 1949. No interest has been shown in reactivating either permission. No information is known in relation to the remaining extent of permitted reserves if any in either of these sites.

**Q2 & 3 Existing Development Plan Position**
Durham County Council’s existing Mineral policies are set out within the County Durham Minerals Local Plan (December 2000). The approach of the Minerals Local Plan to minerals was based upon an understanding of future need at the time the plan was prepared (in the late 1990s). On the basis of the very low sales of silica sand from Weatherhill Quarry and the extent of permitted reserves of silica sand at Weatherhill Quarry which were considered “adequate for the Plan period and well beyond”, no specific provision was made for silica sand.

The County Durham Minerals Local Plan does not refer to the requirement to maintain a landbank of 10 or 15 years for silica sand. It is understood that this was due to the limited information available on permitted reserves and sales but also that these figures related to only one individual site.

The County Durham Minerals Local Plan does not allocate sites for silica sand, instead it contains a number of criteria based policies which would be used to assess and determine any application for new silica sand extraction. However, experience
has shown that a proposal for new silica sand working coming forward is unlikely. No pre-application discussions or planning applications for new silica sand working have come forward for many years. Similarly, despite two calls for sites for new allocations as part of work to prepare the County Durham Minerals and Waste Development Framework (work started on these DPDs in 2004 and was abandoned in 2008 due to local government reorganisation) and later the County Durham Local Plan (2008 to date) no new site proposals for silica sand have come forward from the mineral industry.

Through future work the Council will prepare a Minerals and Waste Policies and Allocations DPD. This DPD will support the emerging strategic minerals policies in the emerging County Durham Local Plan. If needed the Minerals and Waste Policies and Allocations DPD will contain a specific policy on silica sand.

Q4. Maintaining a landbank and production
Durham County Council has not sought in the past to maintain a landbank of silica sand. In this regard information on silica sand sales and permitted reserves has been difficult to obtain.

As stated above the operator of Weatherhill Quarry ceased production of silica sand in 2011 and the quarry closed. Given these circumstances we cannot maintain production.

Durham County Council is not aware of any unmet need for silica sand within County Durham and we are not relying on other authorities to supply need from County Durham.

Through the emerging provisions of the County Durham Local Plan, which was submitted for examination in April 2014, the Council is seeking to safeguard the entirety of the silica sand resource in County Durham. In addition through the preparation of a subsequent development plan document, the Minerals and Waste Policies and Allocations document, we will consider the need for a specific silica sand policy and undertake a further call for sites.

Q.5 Duty to Cooperate discussions
Durham County Council has had regular discussions with other Mineral Planning Authorities in the North East of England and both Cumbria and North Yorkshire County Council during which no discussion on silica sand has occurred.

Q.6 Location of Silica Sand Resource and Sites
The silica sand resource in County Durham lies entirely within the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the north of Stanhope in Weardale. This link shows the location of the silica sand resource: http://spatial.durham.gov.uk/localplan/default.aspx?layerid=25&x=411898&y=537216&scale=400000

Weatherhill Quarry is shown here:
Silica Sand Options
Seeking to identifying specific sites and/or extensions if at all possible and including a criteria based policy would seem the best course of action and would provide a plan led approach.

Please contact me if you have any further questions.

Yours sincerely

Jason Mckewon B.A. (Hons) MTP MRTPi
Senior Policy Officer
Spatial Policy Team
Regeneration and Economic Development
Durham County Council
Telephone 03000 263 403
Email: Jason.mckewon@durham.gov.uk

Help protect our environment by only printing this email if absolutely necessary. The information it contains and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are only intended for the person or organisation to whom it is addressed. It may be unlawful for you to use, share or copy the information, if you are not authorised to do so. If you receive this email by mistake, please inform the person who sent it at the above address and then delete the email from your system. Durham County Council takes reasonable precautions to ensure that its emails are virus free. However, we do not accept responsibility for any losses incurred as a result of viruses we might transmit and recommend that you should use your own virus checking procedures.

Join in the South Downs GeoTour treasure hunt Find the secret caches hidden in fake bird boxes, hollow logs or false stones using your mobile phone or GPS, stamp your passport, collect points and claim your prize. Find out more at southdowns.gov.uk/geocaching

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and/or contain personal views that are not the Authority’s. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us and delete the message from your system immediately. Under Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation contents may be disclosed and the Authority reserves the right to monitor sent and received emails.
SI09: Response from Norfolk County Council, September 2015
Dear Ms Potts

Re: West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan: Silica Sand Supply Options

This is an officer level response and is made without prejudice.

Introduction

Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority for Norfolk has planned for the production of Silica Sand in its adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (September 2011). Core Strategy Policy CS1 contains a requirement to meet an annual production target of 750,000 tonnes per annum.

Please find below a link to the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy:
http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/ncc094912

The Minerals Site Allocations Plan was adopted in October 2013 and contains a site specific allocation (reference MIN40) for the extraction of three million tonnes of silica sand. Please find below a link to the adopted Minerals Site Specific Allocations Plan:
http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/ncc126927

A requirement for a Single Issue Review of Silica Sand was a Main Modification to the Mineral Site Specific Allocations Plan as a result of insufficient acceptable sites being submitted. This resulted in a shortfall in planned silica sand allocations.
Sites were considered unacceptable as a result of uncertain impacts on a European designated site.
The Single Issue review is currently being prepared. Please find below a link to the consultations page for the Single Issue Review:

Continued…/
Questions

1. Your Current position in relation to silica sand?
   a) Norfolk currently has one permitted silica sand working at Leziate which is connected to a processing plant and railhead and operated by Sibelco UK Ltd.
   b) Norfolk had 3.5 million tonnes of permitted reserves as at 31/12/14, and an adopted allocation for 3 million tonnes.
   c) The majority of silica sand from Norfolk is used for glass making and supplies glassworks in the Northeast and Northwest of England by rail. All other silica sand is used for other specialist purposes and none is used as construction aggregate.
   d) The landbank at 31/12/14 was 4.67 years based on a planned requirement of 750,000 tonnes per annum.

2. Norfolk is currently undertaking a Single Issue Review of Silica Sand to address the shortfall in planned silica sand allocations. It should be noted that landbanks are calculated on permitted reserves not allocations in accordance with national guidance.

3. The Single Issue Review will allocate Specific sites, or if insufficient sites are submitted it will seek to define Areas of Search in accordance with national guidance, together with an Area of Search Policy which will contain requirements for future applications within these areas.

4. There are significant resources of silica sand within Norfolk and it should be possible for suitable sites to come forward, although some parts of the resource are heavily constrained. Whether a sufficient landbank can be maintained depends in large part on the operator’s willingness to submit planning applications.

5. Norfolk County Council as Mineral Planning Authority have had Duty to Cooperate correspondence with a number of other MPAs and also LPAs who have glassworks within their areas. The outcome was that the qualities of the silica sand in Norfolk are scarce and not found widely in other silica sand resources, that the resource is required to supply the processing plant, and that there are currently sufficient resources to continue to supply silica sand in Norfolk.

6. No, none of our existing, allocated or proposed silica sand sites are within a national park or AONB. One of our aggregate allocations is within an AONB, and this was found sound at examination. There is a requirement to complete an enhanced restoration scheme on the allocation and an adjacent IDO permission which would otherwise not benefit from a modern restoration scheme, with public access and geodiversity interpretation.

The options to be taken forward by the Authorities will need to be based on an assessment of all factors within the Plan area and are a matter for the Authorities. However, we would like to make the following comments. National Policy indicates that wherever possible Mineral Plans should seek to meet the identified need through the allocation of Specific Sites, followed by Preferred Areas and Areas of Search. Therefore, the Authorities should consider the potential for Site Specific allocations to meet the identified need before considering other options, as National Park Authorities are not required to consider Preferred Areas and Areas of Search.

Norfolk County Council has an adopted policy encouraging the extensions to existing mineral workings as necessary infrastructure is already in place in these locations, and this may be an approach the Authorities wish to consider. However, it is recognised that large parts of the Authorities administrative area is covered by designated area and therefore national guidance states that it may in exceptional circumstance be appropriate to rely on criteria-based policies.

If you have any queries, please contact me.

Yours Sincerely

Richard Drake
Senior Planner (Minerals and Waste Policy)
Dear Claire,

West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan: Silica Sand Supply Options

Thank you for your letter dated 11th September 2015. I shall respond to each question you ask in your letter in turn.

1. Our most up-to-date information on permitted silica sand sites, reserves, landbanks and markets is contained in a short Technical Evidence paper which was produced to support the Bedford Borough, Central Bedfordshire and Luton Borough Councils: Minerals and Waste Local Plan Strategic Sites and Policies (MWLP:SSP). I have attached a copy of this document for your information.

2. The Shared Service does have an up to date plan the - MWLP:SSP which was adopted in January 2014. The Plan includes a policy (MSP5) which describes the circumstances in which new silica sand sites may be permitted. The policy states:

“Silica sand sites will be released where there is a demonstrable need for the product to supply individual processing plants in the Plan area and this need cannot be met from existing extraction sites in the Plan area or from alternative materials, in order to maintain continuity of production for at least 10 years.”
The supporting text to this policy acknowledges that the need for further reserves must be balanced against environmental constraints. The Plan also recognises that silica sand processing plants can require significant capital investment and as such it may be necessary to provide a stock of permitted reserves to provide for at least 15 years of operation.

3. The MWLP:SSP includes one Strategic silica sand site - Clipstone Brooke and a criteria based policy which allows sites to come forward, when needed.

4. Whilst the Shared Service does not anticipate any problems in maintaining a sufficient landbank of silica sand, it is aware that annual production of silica sand within Central Bedfordshire has dropped significantly due to Sibelco mothballing its sites in 2014.

5. The Shared Service had a brief duty to cooperate discussion with Norfolk County Council on the matter of silica sand provision, but the issue was not pursued and as such there was no outcome.

6. None of our existing or allocated silica sand sites are located within the AONB. The silica sand deposits are mainly found in the southwest corner of Central Bedfordshire, near Leighton Buzzard, outside the AONB. There is only one active mineral site within the AONB – Kensworth quarry which was permitted in 1953 on appeal and extended in the early 1990s, before the adoption of the NPPF.

The Shared Service suggests that a combination of options 1-3 (i.e Option SS4+) offers the most flexibility and would be the option most likely to be able to deliver the steady and adequate supply of minerals the country needs.

If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact the Minerals and Waste Planning Team.

Yours sincerely

Natalie Chillcott
Minerals and Waste Planning Officer

Direct telephone 0300 300 4891
Email Natalie.chillcott@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
Claire, 
We don’t have any permitted reserves for silica sand, and have not received any interest from silica sand operators during our local plan work.

We have not received any communications from any silica sand end users that may be based in our plan area, and have not had any duty to cooperate meetings with other MPAs regarding silica sand.

We don’t have any comments to make on silica sand supply options set out in your letter.

Regards,
Richard

Richard Sharples
Planning Officer
Planning and Environment
Lancashire County Council
01772 534294
Richard.sharples@lancashire.gov.uk
www.lancashire.gov.uk

From: Claire Potts [mailto:Claire.Potts@southdowns.gov.uk]
Sent: 11 September 2015 13:49
To: Perigo, Stuart
Cc: Kirby, Mike; Rupy Sandhu
Subject: West Sussex Minerals Local Plan - supply of silica sand

Dear Stuart,

As you may be aware West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) (the Authorities) are currently preparing a Joint Minerals Local Plan. Once adopted this Plan will set out planning policy for the supply of minerals in West Sussex to 2033.

The Authorities are currently in the process of identifying and evaluating options with a view to ensuring that those chosen are deliverable and consistent with national policy. Amongst other things, options for the supply of silica sand, which is present in West Sussex, are being considered and the NPPF expects that MPAs co-operate with neighbouring and more distant authorities to co-ordinate the planning of industrial minerals such as silica sand. As we have identified that you have silica sand end users (e.g. glass manufacturers) within your MPA area we would therefore be grateful for a response to the matters referred to in the attached letter by Friday 25 September 2015.

Please contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,
Claire

Claire Potts
Minerals and Waste Manager
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819287 | Mobile: 07557 853260
South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 9DH
www.southdowns.gov.uk | facebook | SDNPA twitter | Ranger twitter | youtube

Join in the South Downs GeoTour treasure hunt Find the secret caches hidden in fake bird boxes, hollow logs or false stones using your mobile phone or GPS, stamp your passport, collect points and claim your prize. Find out more at southdowns.gov.uk/geocaching

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and/or contain personal views that are not the Authority’s. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us and delete the message from your system immediately. Under Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation contents may be disclosed and the Authority reserves the right to monitor sent and received emails.

Thinking about fostering? See why our foster carers think it’s the best job in the world.

---------------------------

This e-mail contains information intended for the addressee only.

It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.

If you are not the addressee you are not authorised to disseminate, distribute, copy or use this e-mail or any attachment to it.

The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and unless specifically stated or followed up in writing, the content cannot be taken to form a contract or to be an expression of the County Council’s position.

Lancashire County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing email.

Lancashire County Council has taken reasonable steps to ensure that outgoing communications do not contain malicious software and it is your responsibility to carry out any checks on this email before accepting the email and opening attachments.
SI13: Response from Hertfordshire County Council, September 2015
Dear Claire

West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan: Silica Sand Supply Options

I am writing in response to your letter of 11 September regarding the preparation of the West Sussex County Council and South Downs National Park Authority Joint Minerals Local Plan and the potential silica sand supply options.

With regard to the national need for the industrial mineral in your area, you have identified through your silica sand study that Nazeing Glassworks in Hertfordshire is supplied with this high grade silica sand resource.

I outline below our position in relation to planning for supplies of silica sand to the user in our area by answering the questions set out in your letter.

1. a) Hertfordshire does not have any permitted reserves of silica sand;
   b) Hertfordshire does not have any remaining reserves of silica sand;
   c) As you identified, Hertfordshire has glass manufacturing supplied with silica sand;
   d) Hertfordshire does not have a landbank for silica sand.

2. The minerals and waste planning policy team has not been approached by silica sand end users regarding concerns about the security of its supply. The team has not approached any end users about the security of the supply of silica sand.

3. The minerals and waste planning policy team has not had any duty to cooperate discussions with any other MPAs to discuss silica sand provision for industrial end users in our area.
With regard to the options for the supply of silica sand as outlined in your letter, I consider that option 4 (SS4+) would be most suitable, that being a combination of identifying specific sites, extensions to existing sites and a criteria-based policy to assess unallocated silica sand sites within your Minerals Local Plan. The preference of one option over another may be considered to limit the scope for maintaining a supply of silica sand.

Should you need to discuss the supply of this industrial mineral to our authority area any further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

P A Carter-Lyons

Trish Carter-Lyons
Planning Officer – Minerals and Waste Policy
Hi Claire,

Please find below Nottinghamshire’s response to your duty to co-operate questions regarding silica sand provision.

Q1. Current position

Nottinghamshire’s reserves of silica sand are contained in two permitted quarries - Ratcher Hill near Mansfield and a recently opened quarry at Two Oaks Farm just south of Mansfield. Both are owned by the same operator; Mansfield Sand Limited. The Two Oaks Farm quarry will fully replace Ratcher Hill quarry once it is worked out by the end of the year/early next year (no extensions are possible) so maintaining existing production levels. Production over the last 10 years has averaged 230,000 tonnes.

Given the recent planning permission at Two Oaks Farm, the landbank now stands at around 40 years, well above the minimum 10/15 years required.

The Mansfield Sand website identifies the following uses for the silica sand: We provide a wide range of innovative products for sports, landscaping and equestrian uses. These include stadia and training ground facilities, championship golf and world class show jumping arenas. Our extensive client portfolio includes some of the most prestigious sporting venues across the UK and Europe. (Mansfield-sand.co.uk)

Q2 & Q3. Plan preparation & policy

The existing plan was adopted in Dec 2005. Policy M7.6 ‘Silica Sand Landbank’ states:

Planning permission will be granted for silica sand extraction that seeks to maintain an appropriate landbank of permitted reserves provided they do not have an unacceptable environmental or amenity impact.

We are currently working on the preparation of the new minerals plan and expect to publish the submission draft consultation document by the end of the year. Proposed policy MP8 Silica Sand Provision states:

1. The extraction of remaining reserves at the following permitted sites will be utilised to contribute towards the provision of an adequate and steady supply of silica sand sufficient for at least ten years:

   SLb Two Oaks Farm

Note: The above sites are shown on the Policies Map
2. **Proposals for silica sand extraction outside the sites identified above will be supported where a need can be demonstrated.**

Q4. No problems expected given the Two Oaks Farm permission.

Q5. No

Q6. No

Options currently being considered:

The overall approach to minerals provision in the emerging Nottinghamshire minerals plan is to identify extensions to existing sites / new sites and or criteria based policies and therefore from our point of view Option SS4+ is considered most suitable.

Any further questions let me know

Regards

Steve

Steven Osborne-James
Planning Policy Team

Information of the development of the new Minerals Local Plan can be found at: Nottinghamshire.gov.uk/minerals

The following message has been applied automatically, to promote news and information from Nottinghamshire County Council about events and services:

Experience and celebrate the Great British wartime at On the Home Front, 1940s Living History Weekend, 26 – 27 September, 11am – 4.30pm at Rufford Abbey Country Park. Free entry, £5 car parking. Find other great events across Nottinghamshire at www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/whatson

Emails and any attachments from Nottinghamshire County Council are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the email, and then delete it without making copies or using it in any other way. Senders and recipients of email should be aware that, under the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the contents may have to be disclosed in response to a request.

Although any attachments to the message will have been checked for viruses before transmission, you are urged to carry out your own virus check before opening attachments, since the County Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage caused by software viruses.

Nottinghamshire County Council Legal Disclaimer.
SI15: Response from North Yorkshire County Council, September 2015
Claire Potts,

Many thanks for your email and letter.

Please see below responses to the specific questions within your letter:

1. The North Yorkshire County Council plan area has 2 sites working silica sand:
   - Burythorpe Quarry, near Malton. An active site which produces resin coated foundry sand and sand for agricultural and equestrian uses. The majority of the silica sand is exported outside the County. At the end of 2013 there were sufficient reserves in the permitted site area to give an estimated landbank of 16 years at end 2013.
   - Blubberhouses Quarry, in Nidderdale AONB and adjacent to a SPA/SAC, has been mothballed since 1991. The silica sand at the site has properties suitable for glass manufacture and there is an estimated reserve of 4 million tonnes permitted at the site. The end date for the permission has passed recently, although an application, as yet undetermined, for an extension of the life of the site, has been received.

2. North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council and North York Moors National Park Authority are currently preparing a Minerals and Waste Joint Plan. The Preferred Options stage of the Plan is due to be published in Autumn. The emerging Plan is expected to contain a preferred policy approach supporting the continuing extraction of Silica Sand at Burythorpe Quarry in order to maintain reserves throughout the period to 2030, ensuring a minimum 10 year landbank. It is also expected the Preferred Options Plan will contain a criteria based policy relating to the Blubberhouses site.

3. The overall geographical extent of potential resources of silica sand within the Plan area is very small, with occurrences in two separate locations: at Burythorpe, near Malton to the east and Blubberhouses, in Harrogate Borough to the west. The emerging Plan specifically refers to these sites within the Preferred Policy ‘Continuity of Supply of Silica Sand’ and circumstances under which new permissions at these sites would be supported. No proposals for extensions to Burythorpe Quarry have been received for consideration through the MWJP. A site submission has been received in respect of Blubberhouses Quarry for an extension of time to enable the continuation of extraction of Silica Sand from the existing site (which has been mothballed since the 1990’s).

4. There is one major manufacturer of float glass in the County, near Eggborough in the Selby District. It is understood that the company import silica sand from Norfolk, and have not voiced any concern over future supply so far as we are aware. There is no indication if and when an additional supply of silica sand would be needed for glass manufacture, plus there is potential supply available within North Yorkshire if the mothballed site at Blubberhouses received a current permission to work.

5. See above

6. Discussions have been undertaken with Norfolk County Council under Duty to Cooperate requirements due to the understanding that a major user of silica sand in the Plan area is known to be reliant on silica sand currently imported from Norfolk. As a result of discussions it is understood that Norfolk County Council considers that suitable areas of silica sand exist in Norfolk which could be brought forward to allow the continuation of operations at the Liziate processing works until at least 2026 (the sole silica sand site in operation in Norfolk).
It is also considered that there are silica sand resources in Norfolk which have the potential to allow extraction until at least 2030.

With regard to the Silica Sand Supply Options presented in your letter it would appear that Option SS4+ (a combination of options 1-3) would be the most appropriate as it offers a certain degree of flexibility. However, without reviewing the entirety of the Options in the emerging Joint Minerals Local Plan in is not possible to provide a comprehensive response.

If you have any further queries please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Best Regards

Minerals and Waste Policy Team
North Yorkshire County Council

From: Claire Potts [mailto:Claire.Potts@southdowns.gov.uk]
Sent: 11 September 2015 13:35
To: Vicky Perkin; MWDF
Cc: Rupy Sandhu
Subject: West Sussex Minerals Local Plan - future supply of silica sand

Dear Vicky,

As you may be aware West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) (the Authorities) are currently preparing a Joint Minerals Local Plan. Once adopted this Plan will set out planning policy for the supply of minerals in West Sussex to 2033.

The Authorities are currently in the process of identifying and evaluating options with a view to ensuring that those chosen are deliverable and consistent with national policy. Amongst other things, options for the supply of silica sand, which is present in West Sussex, are being considered and the NPPF expects that MPAs co-operate with neighbouring and more distant authorities to co-ordinate the planning of industrial minerals such as silica sand. As we have identified that you have silica sand resources and high end silica sand users (e.g. glass manufacturers) within your MPA area we would therefore be grateful for a response to the matters referred to in the attached letter by Friday 25 September 2015.

Please contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Claire

Claire Potts
Minerals and Waste Manager
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819287 | Mobile: 07557 853260
Claire

Thank you for your email regarding future supply issues in relation to silica sand. My thoughts are as follows:

**Question 1:**

We used to have two silica sand sites in Surrey comprising Tapwood Pit / Park Pit, Buckland (operated by Hansons) and North Park Quarry (NPQ), Godstone (operated by Sibelco UK). Tapwood has now been worked out and is in the process of being restored.

In March 2012, we granted planning permission to Sibelco UK for the extraction of 2.5 mt of primarily silica sand from Land North East of Pendell Farm, Bletchingley, the vast majority of which is to be used for non-aggregate uses. The site forms part of a broader area allocated for silica sand extraction in the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy (SMP CS) 2011. A copy of the committee report is attached below (Item 9 - Pendell). This has been presented as an extension to NPQ with the mineral being transported to NPQ by conveyor for processing. As of 31 December 2014, mineral working had yet to commence. I can't give you an overall permitted reserve figure for silica sand at NPQ and Pendell Farm combined for reasons of commercial confidentiality as we only have one operator and two sites in Surrey. However, coincidently, an application to extend the period of working at NPQ is being considered by our Planning and Regulatory Committee on 23 September 2015. I've not read the committee report but I attach a copy below as it should provide you with some helpful information on NPQ.

In terms of markets, there is some information contained within the above committee rpt on Pendell. The two background reports attached below will also be of interest.

In terms of landbanks, I can't give you a precise figure for reasons of commercial confidentiality. However, the results of the AM2014 Survey indicates that the landbank for silica sand in Surrey based on sales recorded in 2014 is between 5 and 10 years.

**Question 2:**

Yes, SMP CS Policy MC8 makes suitable provision for silica sand.

**Question 3:**

The SMP Core Strategy includes one large specific silica sand site allocation (Pendell Farm, Bletchingley), and two areas of search (land adjoining Pendell Farm, Bletchingley and Chilmead Farm, Nutfield Marsh) for possible silica sand extraction in the longer term.

**Question 4:**

Not from our perspective. We have set the planning framework to enable sites to come forward. It is now down to industry.

**Question 5:**
In more recent times, we have been consulted by Kent CC on a planning application for silica sand extraction, but I can't recall the DtC being mentioned in correspondence. I think I sent you details of this application / permission in a recent email. We have also been consulted by Norfolk CC concerning a lack of provision for silica sand in their proposed Site Specific Allocations DPD in the period to 2026, which was not in accordance with their adopted Core Strategy. This was to be addressed through a future Core Strategy review in 2015. In June 2013, we responded to Norfolk CC as follows:

"Surrey County Council (SCC) note the anticipated shortfall in silica sand provision against the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. SCC welcomes the proposed commitment at paragraph 2.7 to undertake a single issue review which will consider land for site specific allocations, preferred areas and/or areas of search that would be suitable to address this shortfall. SCC also notes that the review would be completed by 2016. SCC request that it be consulted regarding the review at the earliest opportunity."

Earlier this year we were consulted by Norfolk CC (Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD - Single Issue Review of Silica Sand, Initial consultation). We replied on 19/3/2015 with no observations. I can't recall why with any certainty but have a feeling Norfolk were committed to addressing this shortfall.

Question 6:
Our existing sites at North Park Quarry and land North East of Pendell Farm are both partly within the AONB. The two committee reports attached above explain how this issue has been dealt with. In terms of the allocation of Pendell Farm, the key development requirements stated in the Surrey Minerals Plan require any application to demonstrate the public interest in working the land within the Surrey Hills AONB, assess visual impact and impacts on landscape character and features of the area giving particular attention to the potential effect on the natural beauty, local character and distinctiveness of the Surrey Hills AONB. Policy MC2 of the SMP Core Strategy DPD (attached below) deals with mineral extraction in the AONB.

Options
In terms of options, it is difficult to comment without knowing the context of the plan area in relation to silica sand working (currently and in the past). I would say that the need is more likely to be national rather than local (as silica sand can travel a significant distance) although I don't think this limits the case for bringing sites forward if considered necessary. In Surrey, the AONB has not prevented us from identifying suitable sites and bringing these forward for development provided certain conditions are met / demonstrated as set out in the two attached committee reports. In saying that, some of the deposits in Surrey are of a very high quality. In terms of the options, one and two have the obvious advantage of providing greater certainty for industry and the population in general and provide the planning authority with greater control over where development might take place in future. In this respect, there are clear advantages with options 1 or 2 or a combination of the two. The danger with option 3 is that it places a larger amount of the plan area (and presumably the National Park) at risk of development reducing the ability of the planning authority to control development in designated landscapes and more sensitive areas.

I trust you find this information helpful.

Regards
David

Claire Potts <Claire.Potts@southdowns.gov.uk>  To David Maxwell <david.maxwell@surreycc.gov.uk>
David,

As Paul is away, please see email below.

Kind regards

Claire

From: Claire Potts
Sent: 11 September 2015 13:42
To: Paul Sanderson <paul.sanderson@surreycc.gov.uk>
Cc: ‘mwdf@surrey.gov.uk’ <mwdf@surrey.gov.uk>; Rupy Sandhu <Rupy.Sandhu@westsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: West Sussex Minerals Local plan - future supply of silica sand

Dear Paul,

As you may be aware West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) (the Authorities) are currently preparing a Joint Minerals Local Plan. Once adopted this Plan will set out planning policy for the supply of minerals in West Sussex to 2033.

The Authorities are currently in the process of identifying and evaluating options with a view to ensuring that those chosen are deliverable and consistent with national policy. Amongst other things, options for the supply of silica sand, which is present in West Sussex, are being considered and the NPPF expects that MPAs co-operate with neighbouring and more distant authorities to co-ordinate the planning of industrial minerals such as silica sand. As we have identified that you have silica sand resources within your MPA area we would therefore be grateful for a response to the matters referred to in the attached letter by Friday 25 September 2015.

Please contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Claire

Claire Potts
Minerals and Waste Manager
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819287 | Mobile: 07557 853260
South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 9DH
www.southdowns.gov.uk | facebook | SDNPA twitter | Ranger twitter | youtube

Join in the South Downs GeoTour treasure hunt Find the secret caches hidden in fake bird boxes, hollow logs or false stones using your mobile phone or GPS, stamp your passport, collect points and claim your prize. Find out more at southdowns.gov.uk/geocaching
SI17: Response from Kent County Council, January 2016
Dear Claire

West Sussex Joint Minerals and Waste Plan: Silica Sand Supply Options

Thank you for contacting the Kent County Council on the matter of silica sand supply within the West Sussex County Council’s and South Downs National Park Authority’s joint minerals plan area and future provision issues.

Having carefully considered your points on the silica sand mineral planning issues 1 to 6 and potential policy options SS1 to SS4 as set out in your email of the 11 September 2015, I have the following responses and comments to make.

1. There are several quarries operating in Kent, though there has been some contraction in recent years. For details of this and silica sand in Kent and Surrey I would like to refer you to our Plan Examination web page (http://consult.kent.gov.uk/portal/mwcs/mwlp-eip/eip-library/) and document KCC/MWLP/CS/028 A Study of Silica Sand Quality and End Uses in Surrey and Kent March 2010. Page 46 has a table breaking down the operational sites in Kent and Surrey in 2010. The table below is a partial adapted copy to bring it up to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarry</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Processing</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reserves and Markets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addington (Wrotham)</td>
<td>Fern Group</td>
<td>washing,</td>
<td>Industrial sand, non-</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Recent planning permission for 0.98 million tonnes of silica sands and 0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>classification,</td>
<td>construction aggregate,</td>
<td></td>
<td>tonnes soft sands, silica sand land bank of some 10 years, markets for foundry uses,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drying</td>
<td>construction sand</td>
<td></td>
<td>grouts, roofing felts, sealants, dry sands for wax-coated equestrian sands, with moist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Katie Stewart
Director of Growth, Environment and Transport
The table address your points A) to D).

2. The Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30 (modified) is currently out to consultation for the modifications that flowed from the Independent Examination hearings held in April and May of this year. The consultation event closes in early October 2015 (see the following link: [http://consult.kent.gov.uk/portal/mwcs/mwlp-submission/proposed_mods](http://consult.kent.gov.uk/portal/mwcs/mwlp-submission/proposed_mods)). The Plan’s policy CSM 2 Supply of Land-won Minerals in Kent addresses silica sands at point 3. This part of the policy follows the NPPF requirements for the maintenance of permitted reserves at sites to maintain production for the NPPF compliant period of time (10 years for established sites and 15 years for sites with the need for extensive capital investment) and that any planning applications are determined in accordance with these requirements and also to ensure that there is a demonstration that a) the material meets the technical specifications required for an industrial sand and b) how the mineral will be used efficiently for high grade silica sand applications.

Katie Stewart
Director of Growth, Environment and Transport
3. The currently being examined Plan is not a site allocation plan; this will come later following the adoption (it is hoped) of the Plan with specific site allocations in a Minerals Sites Plan.

4. Given that the NPPF does not require a maintained landbank of the type applicable to aggregates the situation is rather different. Where an operational site exists it is incumbent on the County Council, as the mineral planning authority, to ensure reserves are permitted to enable the NPPF stipulations to be met. The recent planning permission at Addington (Wrotham) Quarry meets this requirement. Aylesford Sand Pit has reserves that are, apparently now unviable, and has ceased operation and the other sites have moved toward soft sand production given the geological conditions of the respective sites. Therefore, at present the Kent situation is in compliance with the NPPF.

5. There have been no recent discussions with neighbouring mineral planning authorities on the specific issuer of silica sand supply. The joint Kent and Surrey GWP consultant’s report in 2010 represented joint research and cooperation to inform our respective plans as they are formulated. The idea of supply agreements flowing from cooperative talks I imagine is possible especially where there is an operational site that straddles an administrative border, or a facility of such economic (national) importance that can only continue if additional reserves are secured from a site some distance away from the established facility in another authority’s area. The NPPF is silent on such justifications for permitting sites or inclusion of allocations in mineral local plans where no established concern currently exists, though it may be possible to plan supply in this manner, cooperatively, and not be acting ultra vires. This may well be a matter for a legal opinion to clarify.

6. In permitting the recent extension to Addington (Wrotham) Quarry (planning application ref. TM/14/4075) the issue of the exceptions test required for permitting development in the AONB in Kent was addressed. Please use the following link that will direct you to the County Council’s planning application search engine (http://host1.atriumsoft.com/ePlanningOPS/kent/searchPageLoad.do). The officer’s report in the conclusion (para. 212-218) details how the need for the mineral was judged sufficient to warrant extraction in the AONB. At present work on the Mineral Sites Plan has not recommenced and any additional silica sand sites to the Addington Quarry extension, which was an identified Preferred Option site in this document which concluded:

Whilst the site lies within the Kent Downs AONB, it is a proposed extension to one of Kent’s three silica sand quarries which is a mineral of national importance. The site would be allocated for its silica sand reserves which is the more substantial sand type by a ratio of 2:1. It is therefore likely that this site would meet the ‘exceptional circumstances’ test required for development in the AONB. (23) Excavation of the silica sand will also release almost half a million tonnes of soft sand for building use.

The Joint authority’s supply options SS1, SS2, SS3 and SS4+ are noted. It is considered that the identification of need appears to be an initiative that comes from the industry, as this is changing through time with different, often highly specialised bespoke markets expressing a need for an industrial or silica sand with particular characteristics. I am wary of the view that a mineral planning authority could accurately assess these needs into the future so Options SS1 could be problematic to achieve with any certainty, though a criteria based policy Option SS3 route may alleviate this uncertainty problem. Certainly all sites that are identified as silica sand sites or potential silica sand sites (in the Folkestone Formation) should be safeguarded and sites may well then come forward as new sites with an argued

Katie Stewart
Director of Growth, Environment and Transport
justification that can be assessed on their merits. Then there are the existing sites, extensions may well be important to the industry and allocations identified in sites plans to meet the NPPF requirements, essentially the Option SS2 route, would have to be done, provided the resource exists.

I hope these points are useful in your deliberations, I or my colleague Bryan Geake would be happy to discuss any of the above further.

Yours sincerely,

Sharon Thompson
Head of Planning Applications
Dear Claire

In response to your letter dated 11 September 2015, please see information below:

1. a) Permitted sites in Staffordshire: Moneystone Quarry near Oakamoor which was the only recent supply of industrial sand in Staffordshire, ceased production in 2011 and is being restored. Silica sand is now only produced at Hurst Quarry, Biddulph and the sand from this quarry is used as horticultural product rather than as industrial sand.
   b) Remaining reserves: There is no publicly available figure for remaining reserves at Hurst Quarry but the current permission provides for mineral extraction up to 2036.
   c) Markets: Moneystone Quarry was a significant source of sands used for clear glass manufacturing and it is understood that replacement supplies are extracted at Sibelco’s sites in Norfolk. As indicated above, the sand from Hurst Quarry is used as horticultural product (bunker sand, etc).
   d) Landbanks: The current Minerals Local Plan adopted in 1999 required a 10 year landbank to be maintained for Moneystone Quarry and included an area of search for maintaining production at the Moneystone plant. An application (SM.06/10/122 M) in relation to the area of search was refused in 2007.

2. Our emerging new Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire does not provide for the maintenance of a landbank at Hurst Quarry.

3. The Plan does not allocate specific sites or have a criteria based policy to allow sites to come forward when needed.

4. N/a

5. The county council was consulted by Norfolk CC in respect of a Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document. No objections were raised by Staffordshire CC in respect of this document and proposed focussed changes relating to the provision of silica sands.

6. Hurst Quarry is not within a national park or AONB.

Kind regards,

Matthew Griffin
Team Leader (Minerals Planning Policy)
Office location: No. 1 Staffordshire Place (Floor 2), Stafford ST16 2LP
Postal address: Planning, Policy & Development Control, c/o Staffordshire County Council, 2 Staffordshire Place, Tipping Street, Stafford. ST16 2DH

Tel. 01785 27-7275

Visit the Staffordshire Planning at www.staffordshire.gov.uk/planning
From: Claire Potts [mailto:Claire.Potts@southdowns.gov.uk]
Sent: 11 September 2015 13:40
To: Griffin, Matthew (Place)
Cc: Castree-Denton, Julie (Place); Rupy Sandhu
Subject: West Sussex Minerals Local Plan - future silica sand supply

Dear Matthew,

As you may be aware West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) (the Authorities) are currently preparing a Joint Minerals Local Plan. Once adopted this Plan will set out planning policy for the supply of minerals in West Sussex to 2033.

The Authorities are currently in the process of identifying and evaluating options with a view to ensuring that those chosen are deliverable and consistent with national policy. Amongst other things, options for the supply of silica sand, which is present in West Sussex, are being considered and the NPPF expects that MPAs co-operate with neighbouring and more distant authorities to co-ordinate the planning of industrial minerals such as silica sand. As we have identified that you have silica sand resources within your MPA area we would therefore be grateful for a response to the matters referred to in the attached letter by Friday 25 September 2015.

Please contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Claire

Claire Potts
Minerals and Waste Manager
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819287 | Mobile: 07557 853260
South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 9DH
www.southdowns.gov.uk | facebook | SDNPA twitter | Ranger twitter | youtube

Join in the South Downs GeoTour treasure hunt Find the secret caches hidden in fake bird boxes, hollow logs or false stones using your mobile phone or GPS, stamp your passport, collect points and claim your prize. Find out more at southdowns.gov.uk/geocaching

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and/or contain personal views that are not the Authority’s. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us and delete the message from your system immediately. Under Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation contents may be disclosed and the Authority reserves the right to monitor sent and received emails.

Disclaimer
This e-mail (including any attachments) is only for the person or organisation it is addressed to. If you are not the intended recipient you must let me know immediately and then delete this e-mail. If you use this e-mail without permission, or if you allow anyone else to see, copy or distribute the e-mail, or if you do, or don't do something because you have read this e-mail, you may be breaking the law.

Liability cannot be accepted for any loss or damage arising from this e-mail (or any attachments) or from incompatible scripts or any virus transmitted.

E-mails and attachments sent to or received from staff and elected Members may be monitored and read and the right is reserved to reject or return or delete any which are considered to be inappropriate or unsuitable.

Do you really need to print this email? It will use paper, add to your waste disposal costs and harm the environment.

Join in the South Downs GeoTour treasure hunt Find the secret caches hidden in fake bird boxes, hollow logs or false stones using your mobile phone or GPS, stamp your passport, collect points and claim your prize. Find out more at southdowns.gov.uk/geocaching

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and/or contain personal views that are not the Authority’s. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us and delete the message from your system immediately. Under Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation contents may be disclosed and the Authority reserves the right to monitor sent and received emails.
Minutes of the meeting of SEEAWP held on 10 November 2015 at Hampshire County Council, Winchester

Present

Tony Cook Chairman – East Sussex  
Richard Read Secretary  
Peter Day Oxfordshire Rupy Sandhu West Sussex  
Bryan Geake Kent Alan Everard Tarmac  
Lester Hannington Buckinghamshire Bob Smith Hanson  
Lisa Kirby-Hawkes Hampshire David Payne MPA  
Matt Meldrum West Berkshire Mark Russell BMAPA  
Chris Mills Isle of Wight Steve Cole RBMR  
Claire Potts South Downs Eamon Mythen DCLG  
Paul Sanderson Surrey Nick Everington The Crown Estate

Welcome & Apologies

The Chairman welcomed everyone. Apologies were received from Gill King (Milton Keynes), Catherine Smith (Medway) Rebecca Williams/Sarah Ball (Windsor and Maidenhead), Mark Worringham (Reading), Richard Ford (Brett), Stewart Mitchell (Grundon), James Trimmer (PLA), Richard Linton (London AWP), Sue Marsh (EEAWP).

1 Minutes and Matters Arising from 27 October 2014 meeting

Minutes:

Paragraph 5.3 – the ‘track change’ in the draft Minutes to address a matter raised by DP on growth in aggregate sales was agreed.

Matters Arising not dealt with under other agenda items:
Paragraph 3.3 - MR queried if the discrepancy in the marine landings data in West Sussex’s LAA had been resolved. RS reported he had discussed this with the operators and concluded there had been double counting and the data had been corrected.

2  **MPA/POS Guidance on Local Aggregate Assessments (LAAs)**

2.1 The Chairman noted the publication of the Guidance since the last SEEAWP Meeting, and the press items with supportive quotes from MPA. DP reported that the recent workshop at Warwick on the Guidance was useful. A note is being prepared on proceedings to help inform changes to the ‘live’ Guidance. The notes will be forwarded to POS (Lonek Wojtulewicz)

3 **Local Aggregate Assessments**

3.1 Prior to the discussion on the submitted LAAs the Chairman asked about the progress on AM 14. EM reported that the AM steering group had met recently. The survey is on course and by the end of March 2016 a report fit for publication will be submitted to DCLG. However, ministerial clearance (James Wharton) is required, but it was not expected that this would cause undue delay.

3.2 The Secretary then introduced SEEAWP 15/04 that summarised and reviewed the LAAs so far. He explained that the conclusion from the last round of LAAs that the south east was making an appropriate contribution to aggregate supply regionally and nationally was still valid. SEEAWP 15/04 identified some specific issues with each LAA. The Secretary then introduced each LAA and the mineral planning authority representative commented before a general discussion which is minuted below.

3.2 **Oxfordshire**

RR questioned the limited reference to demand in the update provided. PD indicated that this would be addressed when the full LAA is produced.

DP considered the ‘LAA 14 Provision Figures’, Oxfordshire’s alternative to the average sales indicator, to be a sensible approach. There is a need for common sense in the use of land banks as they are not a full reflection on demand. Demand forecasting at local level is difficult. Sales data is a proxy.

3.3 **Buckinghamshire**

RR highlighted the reference to significant infrastructure projects noted in the LAA.

LH explained that they had examined housing trends to assess expected growth but there was incomplete local plan coverage in the county.

DP welcomed the attempt at assessing productivity of sites (para. 5.5) as a reserve total does not always reflect what can be produced annually.

BS noted that restrictions on lorry movement at Bucks sites limits production.

PD reflecting this point remarked that Oxfordshire has a significant part of its reserve tied up in one site which limits annual production.

SC noted that the potential for secondary aggregate from the new EfW may not be
reflected in Bucks sales as the 'raw' material may pass out of the county to an external processing site.

3.4 Surrey
PS noted that Surrey’s resource limitations is well recognised, but new permissions this year mean the 7 years land bank is secure for the next 10 years. Sale of soft sand and gravel are higher this year. The county is looking at alternatives in order to provide ‘headroom’.

AE queried when surrounding counties would need to take account of Surrey’s difficulties.

The Chairman thought this was a difficult to answer, but something for future LAAs to consider.

DP highlighted that objectors were comparing approaches between Oxfordshire and Surrey particularly in relation to the mothballing of sites. Therefore, mpa’s need to be aware that these will be looked at by objectors.

DP compared Surrey’s approach to Oxfordshire’s and noted the former using their Mineral Plan apportionment as a basis for their Assessment. This gave more flexibility.

PD thought the longer term supply issue needs to be looked at in a wider geographic context as adjoining counties are stressed.

The Secretary highlighted that there was a common theme amongst LAAs particularly where reliance on alternative sources of supply is placing pressure on already constrained infrastructure.

3.5 East Sussex, Brighton and Hove and South Downs
TC said the land bank was going down fast so the emphasis is on monitoring the situation. The main resource is on the East Sussex – Kent boundary. Also the resource is constrained by candidate European designations.

3.6 West Sussex and South Downs
RS thought that the soft sand supply the big issue for the county.
CP reported that the soft sand study commissioned by the National Park Authority would be published in Spring 2016.

SC thought that soft sand was emerging as the perfect storm as there was no alternative supply. He thought there is an increasing demand for the material as asphalt sand.

MR agreed there is a large increase in demand for sand.

DP expected West Sussex to look at different scenarios in their mineral plan preparation. RP agreed that would be the case.

There was a discussion on assessing demand for aggregates. The traditional measure of 60 tonnes of aggregate per house which included infrastructure was one approach.

DP noted that the MPA assessment was that overall (GB) demand would soon be at the 2001 level. Per capita consumption is an alternative measure. The MPA will look to publish general data that can help inform the local situation. Also qualitative assessments are helpful.
AE thought that it was important that a planned long term consistent supply was the key to ensuring the appropriate investment is made.

NE thought that there is potential, which hitherto has not been exploited, for soft sand supply in the South and East Marine Plan areas. The Secretary raised the issue of chlorides in marine supplies of aggregate – an issue of the past – but NE asserted that the evidence did not support this concern. There was no ‘consumer’ resistance to sand dredged in the Bristol Channel and this experience could translate to the English Channel and North Sea.

NB Hyperlinks provided by Mark Russell on this issue:

PD thought that housing is an unreliable indicator of demand. Advice by Atkins to Oxfordshire was that population/aggregate sales was a better indicator.

3.7 West Berkshire

MM reported that the latest information indicates that the land bank in West Berks is now 8.1 years, but LAA recognises the need for a Mineral Plan. Nevertheless the sales average is down. There is a complication in that the rail heads show a distorted picture of sales as so much material is exported. Notwithstanding this, sales are the best indicator of demand.

3.8 Kent

BG said that in the supply of aggregates was in the longer term dependent on maintaining the infrastructure for alternative materials. This was demonstrated by the controversy over safeguarding of the wharf at Gravesend

NE emphasised the importance of maintaining sufficient capacity of wharfeage to ensure effective competition.

3.9 Hampshire, Southampton, Portsmouth, New Forest and South Downs

NE thought that there was sufficient marine resource available to meet Hants requirements but insufficient work in proving it.

L K-H explained that there is a constrained supply currently but a number of applications are expected shortly. It was noted that the wharves on the Itchen in Southampton are under regeneration pressures.

NE thought that options for alternative wharf infrastructure in Southampton are limited. LK-H said that additional criteria had been added in the recent Safeguarding SPD. This required all local authorities to consult HCC on planning applications that could have an effect on wharves, including by encroachment by incompatible land uses.

3.10 General

CM explained that the IoW LAA was underway and will available by the end of the year. The Secretary reported that Medway would be publishing a LAA shortly. MM announced that the Berkshire authorities intended to produce a joint LAA by the end of the year. Moreover Milton Keynes had submitted some information on aggregate sales.

NB The LAA has now been submitted and will be considered at the next meeting.
The Chairman said the Secretary would write to all MPs on the basis of the discussion on LAAs. PD remarked there were no overall SE England figures. The Secretary said that these could be summed once the missing LAAs are submitted and report would be made to the next meeting.

DP noted that all LAAs have a different approach so it would be useful to have a two page summary of the main statistics and consideration should be given to a template to ensure consistency. Also it would be useful to have, as suggested at the last SEEAWP meeting, changes from the previous year’s LAA highlighted. Only Hants submitted their LAA on this basis. The Chairman suggested that this approach could be considered as part of the review of the POS / MPA LAA Guidance.

It was agreed that the Secretary would write to all the MPs that had submitted LAAs advising them of the above discussion.

4 DCLG Update

4.1 EM listed the new ministerial team at DCLG with Greg Clark as the Secretary of State and James Wharton as the Minister responsible for minerals.

4.2 The ‘new’ Government’s priorities can be summed up by the manifesto commitment; ‘help you buy your own home’ and protecting the environment. Specific policy commitments are:

- Deliver ‘starter homes’
- Help/encourage self building
- Develop ‘brownfield’ sites first
- Protect national parks etc
- Encourage ‘neighbourhood planning’
- Get local plans in place by early 2017. To note this commitment does not apply to mineral plans but does apply if minerals policies are subsumed in a Unitary Local Plan.
- Simplify planning
- Allow communities to have the final say on wind farms
- Shale gas to be developed safely

4.3 With regard to mineral planning the

- AWPs Annual Reports 2013 have been published on the DCLG website
- Annual Minerals Raised Inquiry (AMRI) 2013 statistics were published in February 2015
- AMRI 2014 statistics would be published by end of this year
The AWP contracts had only just been finalised after a long complicated tender process involving 25 tenders for the 9 regions. The AWP administration is now:

- Hampshire CC for the London and South East England AWPs
- David Jarvis Associates for the South West AWP
- Central Bedfordshire for East of England AWP
- Northumberland County Council for North East England AWP
- Urban Vision for North West, West and East Midlands and Yorkshire/Humberside AWPs

The Chair for the South West AWP is to be finalised following a resignation. The contracts are until 2017/18 with a break clause at 31 March 2016 subject to the current Comprehensive Spending Review.

In discussion with stakeholders it is recognised that the four yearly national AM survey and the AWPs are critical to MASS and the status quo has been advocated. The impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review will be known late November/early December.

EM said that the ‘Red Tape Challenge’ on minerals was being conducted by BIS and the evidence they had collected will be published in due course.

EM noted that there was a lack of consideration of mineral issues in the submissions for devolution but it was indicated that this would be subject to consideration if proposals were taken forward.

EM explained that Government looked to delivering its priorities by ‘deals’ or contracts with local government, business and other interests. The AWP contracts can be seen in that way.

**SEEAWP Work Programme & Priorities**

The Secretary introduced SEEAWP 15/05 which recommended that notwithstanding the uncertainty over the future of AWPs, AM15 needed to be progressed early in the New Year. The Secretary also referred to the established cycle of three meetings a year.

PD raised the issue of rail head and recycling sites data missing from AM14. However, it was evident that some mPas had carried out surveys of these facilities, but some not. Accordingly the Chairman asked the Secretary to write to all mPas to clarify the matter. Furthermore those mPas that had not surveyed rail heads and recycling facilities for 2014 data would be asked to do so while AM15 was being conducted.

DP requested that all the LAA key statistics – sales for each mineral, average (10/3year averages), land banks in years, sales of alternative supplies – should be collated for all of the south east in a ‘live’ document. This could easily demonstrate the AWP area performance, and, the data would contribute to the national picture.

EM explained that in connection with gaining an overall national picture there would be an AWP secretaries meeting held shortly and NACG called in the New Year.
5.5 It was agreed that;
   - Priority be given to carrying out AM 15
   - There would be three meetings a year and
   - The Secretary would undertake a summary collation of all LAAs when they were available.

6 Strategic Spatial Planning Officer Liaison Group (SSPOLG)/London Plan
6.1 It was agreed to consider items 6 & 7 on the agenda together
6.2 The Chairman explained that at the recent SSPOLG meeting consideration was given to aggregate demand issues in London particularly in relation to infrastructure. The matter of wharves safeguarding policy was considered critical. Also note was taken of the forthcoming Mayoral election which might have an impact on policy. The GLA wants to liaise further on forward planning for minerals matters in relation to the London Plan.

7 South Marine Plans
7.1 The Secretary explained that the MMO are expected to produce the draft plans by end of the year/early next year and submit them to Defra. However, there will be a long internal process within Government before they are published for comment. The MMO would like to give a presentation to a joint meeting of LAWp and SEEAWP in the meantime.
7.2 The Chairman explained his role on the Sustainability Appraisal Steering Group and that the Marine Plan process was different to the familiar terrestrial plans.
7.3 MR thought that the preliminary draft mirrors the East Marine Plans but the South Plans were different in that there was a lot of detail. Also a new policy (AGG 4) had been introduced that was problematic which might not survive the process.
7.5 MR drew attention to the new ‘right’ for marine coastal local authorities to request a ‘call in’ by the Secretary of State of major proposals and license applications within 16 miles of the coast.

8 Date of Next Meeting
8.1 It was agreed that the next meeting will be a joint one with LAWp to receive a presentation on Marine Plans at the Crown Estates offices in London. The Secretary will liaise with NE and MMO about a date in March/April which will be announced in due course.
8.2 It was also agreed that the subsequent meetings for 2016 would be fixed in diaries by the Secretary and Chairman. The Secretary would also investigate meeting rooms in
London but Hampshire County Council’s Offices would be the reserve venue.

Actions

1. The Secretary to write SEEAWP’s views to all MPs that had submitted LAAs
2. DCLG to be encouraged to arrange meetings of AWP Secretaries and a NCG
3. The Secretary would undertake a summary collation of key LAA statistics when all SE LAAs had been submitted
4. The Secretary would establish which MPs had surveyed rail heads and recycling sites as part of the AM14 survey
5. AM15 forms (AM14 forms for rail heads and recycling sites where appropriate) would be circulated early in the New Year and MPs would be requested to undertake the survey as a priority.
6. The Secretary liaise with The Crown Estate (NE) and other relevant parties regarding arrangements for a joint LAWP/SEEAWP meeting in March 2016. The MMO would give a presentation on the South Marine Plans at the meeting
7. The Secretary and Chairman will establish meeting dates and venues for 2016
SI23: Response from Surrey County Council, January 2016
Hi All,

David from Surrey CC has come back to be with the following info...

From: David Maxwell [mailto:david.maxwell@surreycc.gov.uk]
Sent: 07 January 2016 17:15
To: Natalie Chillcott <Natalie.Chillcott@southdowns.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: soft sand

Natalie

Thank you for your email. Taking each site in turn:

1. The AM2014 survey return for Runfold South Quarry indicated only a very small amount of soft sand remaining. Exports of soft sand from the site finished in December 2014. Any remaining sand is only used to feed an on-site ready-mix mortar plant;

2. Reigate Road Quarry remains active with soft sand only being extracted from the southern extension area known as Common Field. Mineral working is likely to be completed in around 3 or 4 years time although final restoration is not required until 2024;

3. Moorhouse Sandpits is a large quarry which remains active with substantial reserves remaining. Restoration is not required until 2030;

4. Planning permission was granted in October 2015 for an extension of time for mineral working at Alton Road Sandpit involving the extraction of 512,000 tonnes of clay and 770,000 tonnes of underlying soft sand with restoration required by December 2029. Mineral extraction is not expected to commence for 2 or 3 years. As only a bucketful of soft sand was extracted following the original granting of planning permission in 2002, the tonnages referred to remain to be worked. Markets were west Surrey and east Hants I seem to recall from the supporting application documents;

5. Homefield Sandpit remains inactive. Remaining soft sand reserves are not significant. These are understood to be located beneath the temporary aggregates recycling facility and washing plant. The operator has stated that they have no intention of resuming mineral extraction until 2024 or 2026 (I can't quite remember which);

6. Woodhill Sandpit remains inactive as it has been for a very long time. My understanding is that there is no likelihood of mineral working here in future. We include it in the AMR given its outstanding restoration requirements;

7. Common Field is covered above in relation to Reigate Road Quarry as its part of the same site;

8. Mercers South Quarry was granted planning permission in August 2014 for the extraction of 4.1 mt of soft sand but remains inactive. The operator is the same as for Reigate Road Quarry. Mineral working is not anticipated to commence until the completion of mineral extraction at Reigate Road Quarry. Mineral extraction is required to cease by December 2031 with restoration required by December 2036.
Dear David,

Thank you for the duty to cooperate response regarding silica sand you kindly sent to my colleague Claire Potts last year.

The South Downs National Park Authority and West Sussex County Council are now investigating the status of soft sand sites outside of West Sussex and as such I would be very grateful if you could let me know the status of your soft sand sites.

I understand Runfold South, Reigate Road and Moorhouse sites were active in 2014 (according to your LAA), could you tell me if they are still active?

I would also be grateful if you could advise me of the status of:

- Farnham quarry (Alton Road - Wrecclesham).
- Homefield
- Woodhill
- Common Field
- Mercers South Quarry, Nutfield site

Many thanks and kind regards,

Natalie

Natalie Chillcott
Senior Planner (Minerals and Waste)
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819289
South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 9DH
www.southdowns.gov.uk | facebook | SDNPA twitter | Ranger twitter | youtube
Become a South Downs food champion

Discover hundreds of local food and farm shops, restaurants, pubs and cafés, vineyards, breweries and food producers at southdownsfood.org
Dear Natalie,

Thank you for your e-mail and attached letter and apologies for the delay in responding.

We have gone through the questions and the answers are as follows:

Q1
   a) Permitted sites:
      • Arclid Quarry – permission until 2035.
      • Bent Farm – permission until 2021.
      • Dingle Bank Quarry – permission for extraction until 2016 but we currently have an EIA scoping opinion which advises they will shortly be seeking a time extension for extraction until 2019.
      • Eaton Hall Quarry – permission until 2026 but likely to seek a time extension as part of the new site extension proposals due to be submitted imminently.

   b) Permitted reserves: approximately 13.6mt of Silica sand.

   c) Markets: unable to specify as we do not have this information. Previously it has served major glass manufacturers at Pilkingtons but I believe that market it not as strong as it was and they now serve other markets including sports pitches, golf courses etc. The LAA says its used for industrial, horticulture and leisure uses.

   d) Current landbank – we do not have up to date figures at present as work is still on-going. The LAA for 2014 states that for silica, approximately 1.04 million tonnes of industrial sand from Cheshire as a whole (i.e. east and west) was sold in 2011. The Annual Mineral Raised Inquiry 2012 showed a drop in sales to 0.92 million tonnes. In addition to contributing to the overall aggregate landbank, a stock of permitted silica sand reserves are held at each individual site. Two of the four silica sand sites in Cheshire East currently hold a stock of at least 10 years reserves as indicated by national planning policy.

Q2) Our plan was adopted in 1999 and the policies have been ‘saved’. It contains a policy (54) which seeks to maintain a landbank of at least 10 years at each production site throughout the plan period.

Q3) Policy 54 requires that any proven additional sites needed to maintain the landbank are provided from within land identified as preferred areas which are identified on maps in the Local Plan. These preferred areas are generally identified as extensions to existing silica sand sites.

Q4) Very broad estimates of our reserves and sales suggest that potentially we may not have sufficient reserves to maintain the sufficient landbanks at some of our sites. However we are aware of forthcoming planning applications which if approved would release additional reserves of silica. At present we do not
know whether these will be sufficient to address any potential shortfall in landbank figures as we do not have accurate estimates of reserves and we do not have accurate sales figures.

Q5) I am not aware of any concerns, not having been in contact with any silica sand end users. However, this might come out as an issue as the new Cheshire East Minerals DPD progresses through its Issues and Options stage.

Q6) Again, I am not aware of any concerns. However this might come out as an issue as the new Cheshire East Minerals DPD progresses through its Issues and options stage.

Hope the above is of some assistance.

Best Wishes,

Dave.

David Acton  
Senior Planning Policy Officer  
Spatial Planning  
Cheshire East Council  
Westfields  
Middlewich Road  
Sandbach  
CW11 1HZ  

Tel: 01270 686959  
E-Mail: david.acton@cheshireeast.gov.uk

************************************************************************
Confidentiality: This email and its contents and any attachments are intended only for the above named. As the email may contain confidential or legally privileged information, if you are not the above named person or responsible for delivery to the above named, or suspect that you are not an intended recipient please delete or destroy the email and any attachments immediately.

Security and Viruses: This note confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses. We cannot accept any responsibility for any damage or loss caused by software viruses.

Monitoring: The Council undertakes monitoring of both incoming and outgoing emails. You should therefore be aware that if you send an email to a person within the Council it may be subject to any monitoring deemed necessary by the organisation from time to time. The views of the author may not necessarily reflect those of the Council.

Access as a public body: The Council may be required to disclose this email (or any response to it) under the Freedom of Information Act, 2000, unless the information in it is covered by one of the exemptions in the Act.

Legal documents: The Council does not accept service of legal documents by email.
************************************************************************
SI25: Response from North Lincolnshire Council, March 2016
Dear Natalie,

I have been forwarded your e-mail and letter (dated 8\textsuperscript{th} March 2016) regarding silica sand supply from colleagues at Lincolnshire County Council. Please find my responses to the questions in letter below:

1. **Your current position in relation to silica sand?**
   North Lincolnshire has three sites of varying sizes where silica sand is being or has been extracted. These sites are at Messingham (to the south of Scunthorpe), Cove Farm Quarry at Westwoodside (in the south west of North Lincolnshire) and Eastfield Farm at Winteringham (near the Humber Estuary). Information on reserves and landbanks is limited, particularly due to commercial confidentiality issues on the part of site operators.

   It is my understanding that the majority of the silica sand extracted is used for industrial purposes. Again, information on exact end uses is limited.

2. **Does your authority have a (up to date?) Plan in place that provides for the maintenance of landbanks of 10 or 15 years for individual silica sand sites?**
   The current development plan for North Lincolnshire is made up of the LDF Core Strategy DPD (June 2011), the Housing & Employment Land Allocations DPD (March 2016) and the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Saved Policies) (May 2003).

   The Core Strategy DPD provides a broad, strategic policy in relation to minerals provision, whilst the Local Plan (Saved Policies) set out a number of detailed policies for mineral related development (including policies relating to silica sand extraction and identification of future possible extraction sites).

   Looking to the future, it is anticipated that work detailed minerals planning policy and associated evidence base will commence later this year, at which point further consideration will be given to the issue of landbanks for all minerals.

3. **Does it allocate specific sites or have a criteria based policy to allow sites to come forward when needed?**
   As mentioned above the saved policies of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan identifies sites for potential silica sand extraction. Looking to the future, it is anticipated that work detailed minerals planning policy and associated evidence base will commence later this year, at which point further consideration will be given to the issue of landbanks for all minerals.

4. **Do you anticipate any problems in maintaining a sufficient landbank?**
   As mentioned in response to question 1 (above), information to assess the sufficiency of the landbank is limited to due issues of commercial confidentiality. In terms of the future, it is anticipated that work detailed minerals planning policy and associated evidence base will commence later this year, at which point further consideration will be given to the issue of landbanks for all minerals. This will look at identify any shortfalls in requirements and whether supplies are required from other authority areas.
5. Have you had duty to cooperate discussions with any other MPAs to discuss silica sand provision? If yes, what was the outcome of these discussions?
Ongoing duty to co-operate discussions take place between North Lincolnshire and its neighbouring mineral planning authorities, principally via the RAWP regularly. Limited discussions have taken place with Norfolk County Council in respect of silica sand as part of the preparation of their Minerals Local Plan.

6. Are any of your existing, allocated or proposed sites within a national park or AONB? If yes, have you applied the exceptional circumstances / public interest test in para 116 of the NPPF (to either policy making or a planning application decision). If you have, what was the outcome?
Not applicable.

I hope that my response assists you. If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Iain Cunningham
Spatial Planning Team
Planning & Regeneration
Places Directorate
North Lincolnshire Council
Civic Centre
Ashby Road
Scunthorpe
DN16 1AB

Tel: 01724 297577
E-mail: spatial.planning@northlincs.gov.uk

---

From: Adrian Winkley <Adrian.Winkley@lincolnshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 March 2016 14:22
To: Spatial Planning
Subject: FW: Silica Sand

I have been requested to forward to you the attached letter from the South Downs National Park Authority. Please respond to them directly.

Regards

Adrian Winkley
Minerals and Waste Policy Team Leader
Planning Services
Unit 4
Witham Park House
Waterside South
LINCOLN
LN5 7JN

---

From: Natalie Chillcott [mailto:Natalie.Chillcott@southdowns.gov.uk]
Sent: 08 March 2016 12:42
Hi Adrian,

Thank you very much for speaking with me this morning. To summarise our conversation:

- There are no permitted silica sand sites within Lincolnshire (the area covered by Lincolnshire County Council) and as such Lincolnshire CC does not have a landbank of silica sand.
- The emerging Mineral Core Strategy and DM policy Plan, which is expected to be adopted in May 2016 includes a criteria based policy which allows silica sand sites to come forward.
- The emerging Site Locations Plan is unlikely to allocate silica sand sites.
- There are deposits of silica sand in Lincolnshire and as such the Core Strategy and DM Policy Plan includes a Mineral Safeguarding Area for Silica Sand.
- The quality of the silica sand in Lincolnshire is unknown.

Could you please let me know if any of the statements above are inaccurate and/or if you would like to make any further comments. You are also very welcome to respond to any of the questions raised in the attached letter which you feel are relevant.

If you could forward the attached letter to the appropriate person in North Lincolnshire I would be very grateful.

Many thanks and kind regards,

Natalie

Natalie Chillcott
Senior Planner (Minerals and Waste)
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819289
South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 9DH
www.southdowns.gov.uk | facebook | SDNPA twitter | Ranger twitter | youtube
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